DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 299 95 CG 009 099

TITLE	Education for Survival. Sex Role Stereotypes Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
GRANT	OEG-0-72-2507
NOTE	96p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Teacher Rights Program, NEA, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Change; Elementary Schools; *Nondiscriminatory Education; Research Projects; Secondary Schools; Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Attitudes; Socialization; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes one year's efforts to examine sex role stereotypes in elementary and secondary education. It takes an empirical approach to determining how sex role stereotypes are manifested in schools. Traditional techniques of literature review are used to collect data, but the real emphasis is on involving individuals and organizations currently working in this area. A national conference was held as a means of exchanging information and of providing a stimulus for similar activities on the state level. The report is organized into two major sections. The first section outlines the objectives of the total proposal, and is offered as documentation of the project and as a guide for groups who may be developing similar programs. The second section presents a more detailed description of the national conference and the followup activities. (Author)

ED 094299

Education for Survival

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final
Report
Sex Role
Stereotypes
Project
USOE-0-72-2507

July 1973

National Education Association
Teacher Rights
1201 16th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CG 009 099

PREFACE

This report summarizes one year's efforts to examine sex role stereotypes in elementary and secondary education. The activities were carried out under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. We took an empirical approach to determining *how* sex role stereotypes *are manifest in schools.* Traditional techniques of literature review were used to collect data, but the real emphasis was on involving individuals and organizations currently working in this area. Groups were convened not only to gather information but also to determine how their efforts might help change present levels of awareness. A national conference was held as a means of exchanging information and to provide a stimulus for similar activities on the state level.

Throughout the project the emphasis was on expanding the resources of the project and incorporating activities within the existing programs of other organizations and groups. Although the grant was administered by the National Education Association, the materials, conference design, follow-up activities, and continuing efforts were the work of more than 50 organizations and 200 individuals. It is estimated that the funds expended for the conference and follow-up activities totaled four times the amount of the grant. Special credit must be given to a core group of organizations and individuals who participated in ongoing meetings and eventually formed the Coalition of Equal Opportunity in Education. This group provided major input for the project.

The report is organized into two major sections. The first section outlines the objectives of the total proposal. It is offered as documentation of the total project and as a guide for groups who may be developing similar programs. The second section is a more detailed description of the national conference and the follow-up activities.

Special acknowledgment for their efforts in carrying out the project is given to Hazel Blakey who administered conference arrangements; to Martha Matthews, Adele Swedelius, and Julie Putterman who assisted in the preparation of the Final Report; to Samuel B. Ethridge whose support of the project made it possible; and to the other NEA members and staff whose efforts and commitment have made this project and the ongoing program to eliminate sex role stereotyping a reality.

Shirley D. McCune
Project Director

CONTENTS

Preface 2

Section I

PROJECT REPORT

Introduction 6

OBJECTIVE I

To Analyze How Classroom Activities Perpetuate Sex Role Stereotypes 6

- The Socialization Process 7
- Schools and Sex Role Stereotypes 9
- Textbooks and Instructional Materials 12
- Segregated Schools and Student Groupings 13
- Teacher Behavior 14
- Physical Education and Health Education 15
- Counseling and Guidance 16
- Women's Status in the Profession 17
- Extracurricular Activities 18

OBJECTIVE II

To Identify and Utilize Resources for Change 20

OBJECTIVE III

To Identify Materials That Will Increase Teacher Awareness 23

OBJECTIVE IV

To Initiate Cooperative Dissemination Efforts Among Individuals and Groups 24

Notes 25

Section II

CONFERENCE REPORT

Why a Conference? 32

Conference Theme 32

Conference Participants 34

Conference Site 34

Conference Activities 34

Speeches 34

"Sex Role Stereotypes" by Louise R. White 35
"Education for Survival" by Elizabeth Koontz 37
"Education and Economic Survival" by Michele Russell 41
"But I Am My Body: Schools and Physical Survival" by Celeste Ulrich 44
"Sexual Stereotypes—Psychological and Cultural Survival" by Cecilia C-R Suarez 47
"Schools and Political Survival" by Florence Howe 52

Workshops 56

Media Presentations 57

Participant Reactions 58

State and Local Conferences 60

Follow-Up Evaluation 62

APPENDICES

A Organizations Included in Group Consultations 66

B Conference Highlights and Reminders 68

C Conference Program 74

D Statement by Black Caucus 78

E Materials Distributed to Conference Participants 79

F Conference Participants 87

Section I

PROJECT REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This report documents the activities and learnings that took place under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education to the National Education Association for the development and implementation of a national working conference on sex role stereotypes in the classroom. The proposal for the conference outlined four objectives:

1. To analyze ways that classroom activities perpetuate sex role stereotypes (data collection)
2. To identify and utilize resources for change
3. To develop materials for increasing teachers' awareness of stereotyping
4. To initiate cooperative dissemination efforts among individuals and groups.

These objectives were to be met by using a national conference as the focus of data collection, identification of resources, development of materials, and stimulation of similar activities among individuals and groups.

The proposal was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education in January 1972. The impact of the women's movement had been felt in higher education at that point, but very little had been done at the elementary or secondary level. There was a major need to delineate the issues and to identify resources.

The project grant was awarded for a one-year period beginning May 1, 1972. The conference, which was held November 24-26, 1972, became the first national conference on sex role stereotyping and the first conference to focus exclusively on women's issues in elementary and secondary education.

OBJECTIVE I

To Analyze How Classroom Activities Perpetuate Sex Role Stereotypes

The first objective of the project was to identify and delineate the ways in which classroom activities perpetuate sex role stereotypes. Techniques used to meet this objective included review of the available literature; interviews with experts in the field; group consultations with educators, feminists, and related groups; and participation in programs and conferences dealing with sex discrimination in other fields.

It became apparent that the problems of sex role stereotyping could not be understood in the context of classroom activities alone, but must be seen in the context of the total socialization experience provided by schools and the related institutions of our society. As a result, the focus of the project activities was broadened to include all areas of school influence, and efforts were made to include individuals and groups related to other institutions of socialization. Throughout the project, several primary questions guided the activities:

- How does the socialization of girls and boys differ?

- How do schools prepare children for the economic, social, physical, and cultural roles they will occupy as adults?
- What is the relationship between our education system and the unequal status our society accords to women and certain racial and ethnic groups?
- How can individuals and groups begin to intervene in the socialization process and increase opportunities for optimal human development?

The Socialization Process

Three key variables in a child's socialization or preparation for carrying out age-appropriate behaviors are his or her inherent biological endowment, the development of an individual personality or ego identity, and the social group experiences of life.[1] The first two variables remain largely outside the influence of education systems. A discussion of sex role stereotyping in schools, therefore, must focus on the interaction between the child and the groups that form his/her life experience. Each group outlines and prescribes expectations and standards for behavior. Children eventually learn to behave in ways similar to those of the people around them.

Two Black females growing up in rural communities in the South will have very similar socialization experiences. An urban American male of English parentage and an Asian female living in a rural environment in China will be socialized very differently. As a result, not only their individual likes and dislikes will differ, but also the ways they perceive the world, their styles of thinking, the ways they solve problems, and the things they value as most important in life.

Every group within a society develops a philosophy or set of common beliefs, attitudes, and values that it uses as guidelines for individual and group behavior. Societies with little variation of social class, geographical environment, and institutional influence develop a strong sense of agreement as to the rights and wrongs, the desirables and undesirables of life. In larger societies like our own, the shared experiences and agreements are fewer. Although membership in the same national group will provide some similarities of experience, the socialization process will vary with family, social class, culture, and community group.

A child's first socialization experience is provided by the family. Family child-rearing practices most often reflect cultural expectations and standards for age-appropriate behavior. In a sense, a "life script" or life-style is developed for children and adults. This script is believed to provide the learnings necessary for the economic, physical, psychological, and social well-being of the individual and the cultural group.

The mechanisms for enforcing these learnings and ensuring that the child becomes a part of the groups and of the larger society seem to remain consistent across cultures.[2] These mechanisms include—

1. The child's desire and need to obtain affection, regard, acceptance, and recognition from others.
2. His/her desire to avoid unpleasant experiences of rejection or punishment.

3. The child's desire to be like people he/she has grown to respect, admire, or love (identification).
4. The child's tendency to imitate the actions of others (role modeling).

These needs, desires, and tendencies make it natural for children to learn the appropriate behaviors for the roles they will occupy throughout life.

Gender remains the most common basis on which cultures or societies assign differential roles. Historically, women have been assigned a secondary status in nearly every cultural group, although the pattern and extent of this secondary status have varied.[3] Socialization activities have been designed to prepare boys and girls for their prescribed sex roles and to discourage behaviors associated with the other sex.

There may have been some economic and social justification for the strict division of men's and women's roles in the past. The question is whether these roles are consistent with today's urban, technological society and with our democratic value system. It is time to reassess the ways boys and girls are channeled into sex stereotyped behaviors without consideration of their human potential and the changing requirements of our society.

An examination of the pervasiveness of the problem gives us some idea of the strategies that must be developed if things are to change. Betty Levy's essay on sex role socialization[4] provides a framework for viewing sex differentiation in most cultures. The following points are based in large measure on her research:

1. Sex role behaviors are among the first learnings of children. Kagan's work indicates that the male/female distinction is clear to children as early as age two,[5] and other research suggests that preschool children know their sex and the play preferences, behavior patterns, and expectations that adults hold for that sex.[6]
2. Sex roles become more stereotyped and restrictive with increasing age,[7] and cross-sex behavior is less and less tolerated. Boys experience a growing degree of awareness of "feminine" behavior and tend to avoid it[8] more carefully as they become older.
3. Children tend to see the male role as the more desirable one. Numerous studies[9] document the value that children place on this role. Masculine activities are seen as desirable and given higher visibility and status. Girls are encouraged to be tomboys, whereas boys are frequently punished for exhibiting feminine characteristics. Even preschool children indicate a belief that boys have more fun.[10]
4. Among adults, preferred status is given to males, and male children are more highly valued than female children. Surveys indicate that males are more satisfied with their role[11] and that parents tend to view boy babies as more desirable.[12]
5. Acceptance of traditional sex role identity is related to positive psychological adjustment for males and poorer adjustment for females. Males who identify with masculine roles evidence better psychological adjustment

than do females who identify with feminine roles. Females who exhibit high IQ, creativity, and originality are those who internalize cross-sex behavior; often they have exhibited tomboy behavior at some point in their lives.[13]

The differential treatment of males and females begins with a major value assumption: that women and their contribution to society are inferior to men and their contribution. Variations of this belief and its manifestation in personal and institutional behaviors are called sexism. Since sexism is internalized at an early age as a part of the natural socialization of boys and girls in our society, its operation in our lives is largely unconscious. But the consequences of sexism affect everyone. For girls, the stereotypes and assumptions have limited their self-esteem, aspirations, and contributions; for boys, they have perpetuated unrealistic views of the world and denied them the full range of human expression. Any effort to understand and change the role of schools in perpetuating sex role stereotypes must be considered in light of the transactional relationship among schools, community, and society.

Schools and Sex Role Stereotypes

Primary rationales for the maintenance of U.S. public schools have been that they provide the literacy skills necessary for a democratic system and that they make equal educational opportunity available to all citizens. But during the past 20 years Americans have become increasingly aware that schools do *not* provide equal opportunity to all. The Supreme Court's 1954 *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* decision marked open acknowledgment that schools provided for nonwhite children did not meet the test of equality. We are continuing to identify and deal with the ways in which racial and ethnic minorities are denied equality in education.

In the past five years we have begun to identify a second way in which schools shortchange children's growth. Sex role stereotypes, or differential treatment of females and males, operate in ways that deny children the opportunity to develop their full human potential. By prescribing "appropriate" behaviors, the schools channel boys and girls into traditional roles.

Ideally, the public schools should anticipate social change in our society and prepare children to live in the society of the future rather than in the one that currently exists. In actuality, however, the schools tend to reflect and perpetuate the status quo. They are society's most important socialization tools. Racial and ethnic minorities and women represent less powerful groups in our society than the dominant white male group; schools contribute to a "sorting" process that perpetuates these power differences.

As society struggles with the questions of changing the total opportunity structure, we begin to see change slowly incorporated in the schools. Fifteen years ago it would have been difficult to find textbooks and instructional materials that provided any role models for nonwhite children. The ferment of the civil rights movement brought about change, and today the largest nonwhite ethnic groups are represented to some degree in school materials. The women's

movement will eventually have a similar effect on these materials, as society modifies its definition of appropriate roles for women.

To understand the socialization functions of our public schools we need to distinguish the *intent* of school programs from the *actual* outcomes. Reimer has identified four universal functions of schools: custodial care, social-role selection, indoctrination, and provision of skills and knowledge.[14] In carrying out these functions, schools become effective mechanisms for social control and the perpetuation of conformity, social stratification, and dependence on others for learning.

Based on Levy's analysis of the incompatibility between the stated educational function of schools and their unstated socialization functions,[15] we can describe the gap between the professed goals of schools and the actual outcomes:

1. Although schools profess to promote equality of opportunity, they perpetuate inequality in our society. While schools profess learning as a purpose, they actually "teach" institutional conformity and nonthinking.
2. The curriculum, authority structure, and policies of schools reflect social stratification and perpetuate stereotyped images of minority groups and sex roles.
3. Elementary school values are congruent with the traditional demands of the female sex role. They reinforce obedience, social and emotional dependence, and docility.
4. Secondary schools further differentiate appropriate educational activities for boys and girls, placing more emphasis on girls' preparation for marriage and child raising.
5. Girls generally excel in elementary school because of the congruence of school expectations with traditional feminine activities.
6. Underachievement of girls at the onset of puberty, as evidenced by the dropout, results from the increased role conflict and the limited expectations of schools.
7. Schools evidence greater concern for the future of boys than of girls.

Myra Sadker has summarized some existing research on educational outcomes into a "report card" on education's impact on girls.[16] Here are some of the points she includes:

1. Intellectually, girls start off ahead of boys. They begin speaking, reading, and counting sooner; in the early grades they are even better in math. However, during the high school years, girls' performance on ability tests begins to decline. Indeed, male students exhibit significantly more IQ gain from adolescence than do their female counterparts.[17]
2. Although women make much better high school grades than do men, they are less likely to believe that they have the ability to do college work.[18]
3. Of the brightest high school graduates who do not go to college, 75-90 percent are women.[19]
4. As students progress through school, their opinions of boys grow increasingly positive and their opinions of girls increasingly negative. Both sexes are learning that boys are worth more.[20]

5. By the time they are in fourth grade, girls' visions of occupations open to them are limited to four: teacher, nurse, secretary, or mother. Boys of the same age do not view their occupational potential through such restrictive glasses.[21]
6. Decline in career commitment has been found in girls of high school age. This decline was related to their feelings that male classmates disapproved of a woman's using her intelligence.[22]
7. In a survey conducted in 1966 throughout the state of Washington, 66.7 percent of boys and 59 percent of girls stated that they wished to have a career in a professional field. However, 57 percent of the boys and only 31.9 percent of the girls stated that they actually expected to be working in a professional occupation.[23]

If these attitudes and behaviors are an outcome of the education process, it is critical that we begin to examine the specific school practices that transmit these messages about the appropriate roles for boys and girls. There are seven relevant socializing influences within the school experience:

1. *Textbooks and instructional materials,* designed to transmit knowledge and skills, are equally effective at indoctrinating children in societally prescribed behaviors through their selection and omission of life experiences.
2. *One-sex schools and sex-segregated groupings* within coed schools concretely demonstrate differential expectations for boys and girls. In elementary school, reading groups, play groups, and classroom maintenance activities are frequently sex-segregated. In secondary school, vocational classes and interest groups frequently demonstrate stereotyped ideas of the appropriate roles for boys and girls.
3. *The behavior of teachers* is the most critical dimension in the education process, particularly in the elementary school. Teacher interaction with children in the classroom teaches children how to act, how other people will respond to them, how other people will treat them, and the expectations others have for their future development.
4. *Physical education and health education* deny many girls and boys opportunity and encouragement to maintain physical fitness, to internalize healthy concepts of sexuality, and to develop athletic abilities.
5. *Counseling and guidance* go beyond the specialized functions of testing, vocational guidance, and assistance with personal problems. Counseling might be redefined as the affective portion of the school experience, which is carried out by trained counselors, teachers, administrators, and other students. Efforts to optimize the supportive environment for all students are rare.
6. *Women's secondary status in education* prevents children from seeing both sexes in a variety of roles. Role modeling is a primary method of socialization. When a girl sees women only in secondary roles in the schools, her aspirations are channeled into "what is" rather than "what my individual strengths and goals suggest."

7. *Extracurricular activities* such as interest clubs and honor societies provide evidence of adult sanctions. Their differential nature for boys and girls powerfully demonstrates the expectations of the school and the community.

The following sections will examine the implications of these socialization practices as they operate in schools to deny children equality of opportunity. Although the focus of the discussion is the way that sex stereotypes limit development, many of the same practices also tend to perpetuate racial stereotypes and social class stereotypes.

Textbooks and Instructional Materials

Textbooks and instructional materials are not just tools for teaching children reading skills, computation skills, and general information. To a great degree, these materials frame the range of experience for the young student and define reality. Sara Zimet's work on readers demonstrates how textbooks preselect and fashion children's view of the nature of American society. Children tend to accept the sexual, socioeconomic, and racial stereotypes the materials present with such a general aura of authority and finality.[24]

Many studies of the image of women in textbooks have been conducted.[25] The common findings are that women are underrepresented as main characters in stories and illustrations and that the women who do appear are shown as passive, dependent persons, characterized as unstable and weak, and labeled with various negative terms. Lenore Weitzman's work on children's books and textbooks[26] demonstrates the extent to which these negative images predominate. When girls of minority group cultures appear in children's materials, the images are frequently even more sex stereotyped.[27]

Jean Grambs' survey of the research on textbooks[28] moves beyond the content analysis of texts to point out the limitations of our vocabulary as it implies male dominance. Terms such as mankind and manpower have no feminine equivalents and imply a value hierarchy. Thus, the very structure of our language is a continuing source of sex stereotyping.

The importance of correcting sex bias in textbooks cannot be underestimated. longitudinal research documenting the effect of reading materials on children's attitudes and behaviors is sketchy, but it appears that books do have an immediate effect upon children's beliefs. Studies using reading content as a means of changing children's attitudes toward specific ethnic groups have demonstrated that attitudes change in a positive direction with positive character presentations and in a negative direction with negative character presentations. Although these studies measured only the immediate paper-and-pencil responses of children, a potential formative effect was consistently demonstrated.[29]

A recent study documents improvement in textbooks' presentation of minority groups but not in their treatment of women.[30] Efforts are currently underway by textbook publishers to correct some of their stereotyped female images.[31] It is estimated that it will be at least five years before nonsexist materials exist in any quantity.

Interim solutions for dealing with the problem continue to be identified. Nontraditional publishing groups are developing supplementary books and materials presenting positive images of women.[32] Creative teachers are helping their students use simplified content analysis techniques to discover the unfair ways instructional materials portray males and females. A few school systems are developing their own materials and involving teachers in this process.[33] Teacher organizations also are dealing with the problem. The 1973 Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies is directed toward teaching multiethnic studies.[34] NEA has published guidelines for evaluating textbooks and instructional materials.[35] The American Federation of Teachers has encouraged teachers to develop supplementary materials and provided outlines to work from. These efforts, however, are directed at the tip of the iceberg. Substantially greater effort must be given to improvement of instructional materials and to increasing the education community's awareness of the bias in textbooks.

Segregated Schools and Student Groupings

The most obvious form of sex role stereotyping in schools is the segregation of boys and girls into different schools, classes, or activities. Although there may be valid reasons for sex segregation, it is difficult to demonstrate that separate but equal programs are truly equal. A preschool program that encourages boys to play outdoors on equipment that facilitates large muscle development, while providing indoor crafts activities and miniature kitchens for girls, does not provide comparable experiences. It is true that children may enjoy differential sex-segregated activities as a result of previous socialization but it is the responsibility of the school to expand their range of alternatives by encouraging all children to participate in the total program.

Elementary school programs continue "channeling" children by sex. Physical education activities frequently are different for boys and girls. Classroom groupings may perpetuate assumptions that girls are "naturally" better in reading and boys "naturally" better in mathematics and science. Emphasis must be placed on individual achievement without reference to sex.

Sex segregation in classes increases as children progress through middle school and high school. Such segregation in physical education, sex education, home economics, woodworking, auto mechanics, typing, shorthand, welding, printing, and other vocational courses overtly or covertly limits the alternatives for boys and girls. In some school systems vocational and technical courses are listed as "for boys" and "for girls."[36]

This tracking not only reduces personal choice, but it has economic effects as well. The anticipated wages for the trades taught to girls are less than for those taught to boys.[37] The lack of comparable educational opportunity is, in large measure, the beginning of the earnings gap between male and female workers. The seriousness of this problem is highlighted when we consider the increasing probability that girls will be entering the work force (85 percent of today's high school girls will be employed outside the home at some time) and the changing pattern of family stability (if present trends continue, one marraige out of every three will end in divorce).[38]

Tracking harms males as well as females. Boys who wish to develop artistic, dramatic, musical, and literary interests are often discouraged and labeled "sissies." Boys who would select vocations such as cooking or hairdressing may be denied training opportunities. "Survival" courses that teach both boys and girls basic cooking, housekeeping, auto repair, and self-defense are a good way to liberate students from unrealistic views of their sex roles in later life.

Teacher Behavior

The most important factor in eliminating sexual and racial stereotypes in education is the teacher.[39] The behavior of adults within the school system represents the most powerful influence for children's learning. The importance of teacher expectations and the impact of self-fulfilling prophecies in the classroom have been well documented.[40]

Although the relationship between teachers' behavior and the sex of their students has been a relatively neglected area of research, studies generally show that teachers interact more frequently with boys and address more disapproving or controlling comments to them.[41] Jackson and Lahaderne conclude that boys have a more difficult time in school than do girls. "If control messages are crude measures of that difficulty, these sixth grade boys, as a group, have eight or ten times more trouble than do their female classmates . . . . The experience of going to school is clearly very different for boys and for girls."[42]

Girls tend to excel in academic activities until about the seventh grade. From that point on their ability and achievement test scores decline in comparison with boys.' Frazier and Sadker[43] explain the seeming contradiction in terms of the differential development and behavior of girls and boys. Girls entering school are on the average at least two years more advanced in their development than boys. During the early grades their developmental advantage operates in their favor. Further, their socialization has rewarded passive behavior, which is very adaptive to mastering basic learning skills.

Boys exhibit more independent, aggressive behavior, which may require a greater response from teachers. This independence, although requiring more teacher control, encourages self-reliant learning and is particularly helpful after basic learning skills have been mastered. In adolescence, boys' independence and the reduction of their developmental disadvantage combine to eliminate the earlier achievement gap.

Teachers, like everyone else in our society, frequently operate on what Bem and Bem[44] have identified as the "nonconscious ideology" that assigns secondary status to women. They tend consciously or unconsciously to downgrade the importance of education for girls. Frequently their attitude is that girls should turn their attention to future marriage and family rather than to career planning. These attitudes are clearly manifest in the behavior of teachers. Although adult women constitute a large number of the teaching staff, they are seldom found in administrative or leadership positions within the school. Few teachers have been actively involved in the development of women's studies programs or other efforts to eliminate sex role stereotypes. Relatively few opportunities have been available

for teachers to examine their assumptions, attitudes, and values as they relate to sex role stereotyping.

If we are to make positive interventions in the self-perpetuating cycle of the transmission of attitudes, we must expand research on teacher behavior, develop preservice and in-service training programs for teachers, and develop curriculum materials and teaching techniques that will reduce sex role stereotyping.

Physical Education and Health Education

The professed objectives of physical education programs are to develop fitness and to encourage a lifelong commitment to maintaining it. But the reality of these programs is frequently quite different. As children progress through school, the inequalities in their physical education become greater and greater.

In the elementary grades, differences in boys' and girls' physical education are chiefly evident in the number of activities offered each sex.[45] In middle school and high school, we begin to see differences also in the proportion of public funds expended for girls' and boys' programs. One Michigan school district spent 10 times more on boys' athletics than on girls'.[46] A similar ratio was found in a Pennsylvania district.[47] A study in Texas indicated that approximately ten million dollars worth of public facilities were, for practical purposes, unavailable to girls.[48] A second Texas school district exhibited the same pattern.[49] In a study of 60 junior and senior high schools in the state of Washington, not one of the schools reported a girls' physical education budget that was even 50 percent of the budget for boys. The 10:1 ratio of expenditures seemed to prevail as a general benchmark.[50]

Intercollegiate and interschool competitive activities for girls are severely limited. In some cases, female star athletes are denied the right to coaching services and the opportunity to compete.[51] When women's interschool sports are offered, they are seldom included in the computation of points for all-sports trophies.[52] The cumulative effect of these practices may be seen in the fact that not one of the female athletes competing on U.S. Olympic teams during the past eight years received her training in a public school program.[53]

Another manifestation of sex stereotyping practices in sports programs is differential pay for male and female coaches. In some school districts women are not listed as "coaches" but as "intramural instructors" –a distinction that epitomizes the status system in athletics. As instructor, women have less prestige, less decision-making authority, and less influence within the schools. They find it hard to negotiate expansion of programs, equal access to facilities, or equalization of salaries.

Awards and incentives for girls' participation in sports are limited. While male athletes are awarded school letters, jackets, certificates, trophies, and athletic scholarships, their female counterparts are usually rewarded with "personal enjoyment." One school in Colorado awards male members of the tennis team school letters; female members get charms for their bracelets. Until 1973 women were prohibited from accepting athletic scholarships.[54]

Health education is a difficult area in which to document sex role stereotyping. Health content may be provided in a physical education, sex education, biology, child growth and development, or other course. However it is presented, health education seldom gives students a healthy understanding of their bodies or realistic information for planning their lives. Information on reproduction, birth control, family planning, pregnancy, abortion, and childbirth may be omitted, provided in sex-segregated classes, or covered in a sketchy fashion. Boys and girls need opportunities to understand the social, psychological, and economic factors of health and a chance to incorporate sexuality as a natural part of life. Many of the myths and misunderstandings about the role of human sexuality could be corrected by good health education.

Over 200,000 young women under 18 give birth in the U.S. each year.[55] Most of them are expelled from school at the first sign of pregnancy. A 1970 survey of 17,000 school districts revealed that less than one third offered pregnant school-age girls any educational services. When such services were available, they took the form of special classes or assistance with home study.[56] Eighty-five percent of these young mothers will keep their babies.[57] Those who marry at 18 or younger are three or four times more likely to get divorced than all other age groups.[58] Among teen-age mothers who remain unmarried, 85 percent go on welfare.[59] The denial of public education to pregnant girls is a clear case of sex discrimination for which society pays the human, economic, and social cost.

Counseling and Guidance

School counseling and guidance services hold out the promise of a primary intervention for meeting the career planning needs of boys and girls. But most students have little contact with trained counselors. The ratio of counselors to students is 1 to 250 in Portland, Oregon, 1 to 794 in New York City.[60]

Traditional counseling techniques do not seem to be meeting the needs of girls, and no one seems to be making any major effort to develop adequate theory and techniques. A recent study reported in AERA's *Educational Researcher* documented the ineffectiveness of counseling with respect to women and motivation. It concluded that—

> Efforts to increase motivation, such as special counseling and teacher attention, appeared to have little long-range effect on girls, whereas these same efforts seemed to have an immediate and relatively long lasting effect on boys.[61]

Many groups have noted an unmet need for aggressive counseling tools, this is especially critical for girls from lower socioeconomic levels.

Several studies of counselor behavior indicate that both female and male counselors have stereotyped notions about the levels and kinds of occupations that are realistic and appropriate for collegebound and noncollegebound girls.[62] Further, female counselors' needs for self-validation often prevent them from providing support to girls considering nontraditional career goals.[63]

Counseling bias extends to tests and measurements used for guidance. One example is the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, which was cited for sex bias by the American Personnel and Guidance Association and subsequently revised. The instrument had two forms—male and female. A male expressing certain interests would be counseled to become a physician, psychiatrist, or psychologist. A female with identical interests would be steered by the test to such occupations as dental assistant, physical therapist, or occupational therapist.

A study of how psychiatrists and social workers view mental health and healthy males and females found that they hold different concepts of mental health for men and women—concepts heavily influenced by our society's sex role stereotypes. Healthy women are seen as "more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, more easily influenced, less aggressive, less competitive, more excitable, have their feelings more easily hurt, more emotional, more conceited about appearance, less objective, and disliking math and science."[64]

School counseling programs tend to perpetuate many of the same stereotypes. Again, we should not condemn counselors for holding the same biases as other members of our society. Rather, we need to (a) develop a research *program* that will identify the theory and techniques most appropriate for girls, (b) modify the preservice and in-service training of counselors, (c) develop counseling tools relevant to the changing roles of women, and (d) incorporate into school counseling programs vocational information relevant to the needs of girls.

Women's Status in the Profession

The sexually stereotyped positions of men and women in the schools have a subtle socializing influence on students. Denied the chance to see a variety of role models, most girls and boys will not think to break into a field reserved for the opposite sex. Women particularly are restricted from the higher levels of responsibility and leadership in education. In 1970-71 women represented—

- 64 percent of all full-time professional staff of public schools.
- 20 percent of the administrative and supervisory staff.
- 67 percent of the teachers.
- 21 percent of the elementary school principals.
- 3 percent of the senior high school principals.
- 47 percent of the counselors.
- 99 percent of the nurses.
- 91 percent of the school librarians.
- 64 percent of the psychologists and psychometrists.
- Less than 1 percent of the superintendents.
- 5 percent of the chief state school officers.[65]

School administration is more male-dominated today than ever before. The most frequent rationalizations of this phenomenon, which cite the greater economic needs of males and the presumed continuity of their careers, have been shown to be fallacious,[66] but the pattern continues. Perhaps a more profitable approach would be to view male domination in terms of power relationships among groups in our society and to trace the process of how male and female educators are

"shaped" or socialized into acceptance and perpetuation of this pattern. Longitudinal studies of occupational socialization are a major need.

The majority of the members of teacher organizations are female, but the state and national leadership of both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers is overwhelmingly male. A woman has never headed the U.S. Office of Education. At the present time the U.S. commissioner of education is male; his deputies and associates are male; only two women hold positions at the assistant executive level. The average grade level of women at USOE is GS 7; the average grade level for men is GS 14.[67] The absence of women from the higher levels cannot be explained by lack of qualifications. One fifth of the doctorates in education are awarded to women, and 13 percent of these doctorates are in the field of educational administration.[68]

The need for balancing the assignments of males and females in schools is clear. Males must be encouraged to move into classroom positions, particularly on the preschool and elementary levels. Females, on the other hand, must be recruited, trained, and moved into administrative positions. Only when women are visible in all roles within the school will equality become a reality in education.

Extracurricular Activities

Another subtle but important source of sex role stereotyping is found in the organization and sponsorship of extracurricular programs. Most schools offer some activities to meet the special interests of children and to provide character-building experience.

The fact that boys' physical education activities represent greater variety and resources than girls' has already been mentioned. It must also be pointed out that intramural programs for both boys and girls suffer from the focus on the male interschool competitions. A group studying athletic expenditures in Dallas, Texas, estimated that 90 percent of the funds were spent on interschool team sports involving less than 10 percent of the male students. The "star" athlete phenomenon thus limits opportunities for boys as well as girls. Intramural activities allow all students to enjoy sports at their own level of skill; expanding these programs is one means of equalizing educational opportunities.

Other extracurricular activities that may overtly or covertly limit or discourage the participation of one sex include clubs, such as aviation, photography, science, and modern dance, and organizations that represent the school, such as marching band, jazz band, chorus, and debate team. An example of this "tracking" came to public attention in a national high school science program for which only boys were eligible. After protest, the program was changed to include girls. Students need the opportunity to participate in a range of activities based on individual interest.

The granting of honors and awards and the assignment of tasks are other ways of stereotyping students by their sex. This kind of stereotyping is more obvious on the secondary school level, as in the awarding of scholarships, but there are some evidences of it on the elementary school level too. Children are often placed in lines by sex; competitive activities (e.g., spelling bees) may pit girls against boys; halls and stairs may be assigned by sex; classroom tasks (e.g., delivering messages to the office, carrying heavy equipment) may be delegated by sex; and street corners may be assigned to safety patrols on the basis of sex. It is the cumulative effect of sex-differentiated behaviors that reinforces children's sex-stereotyped images of themselves.

OBJECTIVE II

To Identify and Utilize Resources For Change

The identification of sex role stereotypes in education began in the higher education community during the 1968-69 school year. Questions of employment discrimination and the omission of women's contributions from the curriculum provided the focus for change. During the past five years most universities and colleges have initiated affirmative action plans to expand employment opportunities for women. Male-female salary differentials have been eliminated in some institutions, and more than 1,400 courses in women's studies are being offered in colleges and universities throughout the nation.

But the values and leadership of the higher education community have little direct impact on the elementary and secondary education community. As of 1971, when the proposal for this sex role stereotypes project was developed, federal legislation prohibiting sex discrimination in elementary and secondary schools did not yet exist. The primary interest in examining and changing the early socialization of boys and girls was evidenced by small groups of feminists who had little contact with each other. Frequently, the organizational base of these groups was related to the general community rather than to professional educational groups. Examples of these small groups included the Emma Willard Task Force in Minneapolis, Minnesota; the Kalamazoo (Michigan) Committee To Study Sex Discrimination in the Kalamazoo Public Schools; the Ann Arbor (Michigan) Committee To Eliminate Sex Discrimination in the Public Schools; the New York City Chapter of NOW; the Berkeley (California) Unified School District Women's Task Force; and the Boulder (Colorado) Task Force of NOW. A dual task for the project was to attempt to identify these resources and to stimulate interest among groups where it did not already exist.

Three techniques were used to accomplish this dual task: group interviews and consultations with individuals and representatives of groups, regular meetings with representatives of national organizations and interested individuals, and individual telephone interviews. Each of these methods was effective in identifying resources and providing ideas and suggestions for the national conference on sex role stereotypes in education. More than 200 persons representing teacher associations, community groups, state departments of education, national organizations, higher education, feminist groups, government employees, students, and parents were involved in this resource-identification process.[69]

The preconference meetings were invaluable as a means of developing a general framework and planning the materials and design of the conference. Three general principles that evolved from these sessions were articulated and incorporated into the activities of the project; they provide guidelines for any group wishing to develop a program on sex role stereotyping in schools.

1. Use the socialization framework.

The initial plan for the project had focused narrowly on classroom activities with the hope of selecting a specific target for action. But when the classroom-

related questions were examined, it soon became apparent that such a narrow focus was not appropriate for elementary and secondary schools. Major factors in sex role stereotyping, besides the content of classroom activities, are the hidden curriculum of teacher behavior and the general environment of the school.

Children arrive at school with internalized sex role stereotypes. Attempts to change these must be linked to the family and the community. It is not helpful to argue about where the responsibility for stereotypes originates or to try to lable "villains." Rather, it is important to understand how children are socialized into their sex roles by *all* influences on their lives: home, school, media, peer group, community, society.

Change in schools is difficult under optimal conditions. If it is to occur, an attempt must be made to involve every group with an interest in the schools and to develop mutually supportive efforts. Community groups, teachers, administrators, school board members, students, and parents can all initiate efforts and make an effective contribution to change.

The socialization framework was used as a guide for materials development, the design of the conference, and the involvement of groups. It expanded the focus of the project activities from the classroom to the relationship between schools and society.

2. *Include and involve all racial and ethnic groups.*

The adage that we are prisoners of our own experience must be taken seriously. Frequently we generalize from our experience and forget that different racial, ethnic, and social class groups within the community do not share our perspective. Sex role socialization varies within and among groups. Change strategies that might be appropriate for one group may be totally wrong for another. Efforts to initiate action should consider the perspectives of all groups in the community.

Groups examining sex role stereotypes too often forget about the other kinds of stereotypes that also deny children's rights and limit their development. We need to rid the schools of racist and elitist stereotypes, as well as sexist ones. Groups working for various kinds of change must build on their common areas of agreement while at the same time recognizing and accepting differences.

The project being reported made a concerted effort to involve racial and cultural minorities and representatives of various social class groups. Individuals and organizations with nonwhite perspectives were consulted and invited to participate in conference planning meetings. Some also participated in the implementation of the conference. Materials attempted to provide the viewpoints of various groups of women.

Several problems were identified. First, many of the women's issues have been articulated by white women seemingly unaware of the other sources of discrimination and the other ways in which children are denied equality.

Second, women of ethnic and cultural minorities have relatively few channels of national media through which to present their point of view. Materials development activities of the project included a search for nonwhite-oriented materials on the socialization of women. Some materials were commissioned or located, but it is apparent that this area remains a priority for future development.

Finally, it seemed that a number of forces were operating to assist "divide and conquer" strategies. Many individuals and groups saw the movement to obtain sexual equality as antithetical to efforts to obtain racial equality. To some degree, this perception was a natural result of dual objectives of efforts, but it must be given attention by any group wishing to reduce sex role stereotyping in schools.

3. *Involve and consider institutional structures.*

Any attempt to change schools must be incorporated into some existing regularity, either behavioral or programatic.[70] Change must be woven into the institutional fabric and solidly reflected in the behavior of all persons within the schools. If progress is to result, efforts must be made to tune into the programs and concerns of other school-related institutions. It is critical that change efforts focus on specific tangible issues that can be resolved.

An early task of the project was to identify the organizations that make up the education community, such as administrator organizations, teacher organizations, professional associations, student groups, and community groups with interest in the schools. All of these are forces for change. Contacts with these organizations focused on helping them identify ways they could begin to address the issue of sex role stereotyping. The Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, under a grant from the Ford Foundation, is continuing to identify and utilize the many resources for change.

One of the things the project learned was that the success of a contact with an organization was directly related to the specificity of the request for assistance or involvement. Many individuals and groups genuinely wanted to assist but were not clear how they should move toward bringing about change. Any project in this area should plan time and resources for working with other organizations and for action training.

OBJECTIVE III

To Identify Materials That Will Increase Teacher Awareness

Materials on sex role stereotyping in elementary and secondary schools continue to be limited. Traditional methods of locating materials, such as review of the literature and use of reference sources, did not prove as fruitful as informal word-of-mouth communications and contacts with women's groups and other national organizations.

Materials were collected from all possible sources. A few articles had appeared in newspapers or national journals, but the majority of the materials had been published by feminist groups (such as Feminist Press and KNOW) or remained in unpublished papers, studies, and monographs. This general scarcity of formal material and abundance of informal publications can perhaps be explained by the local nature of the studies of sexism in schools, the frequent omission of quality documentation in action projects, the lack of ongoing research programs, and the reluctance of the established media to publish articles on this subject.

The collected materials were analyzed to identify neglected areas. Project staff attempted to locate a knowledgeable resource in each such area from whom to commission the development of materials. The most relevant pieces of material were selected for the conference publications.

A 108-page notebook of reading material was prepared and mailed to each conference participant in advance. The objectives of this anthology were to provide participants with some general awareness of the problems and to begin to direct their concerns to action planning during the conference. A second collection of "how to" materials was prepared for use during the conference. The materials included in these notebooks are listed in Appendix E.

Since the conference, more than 300 full sets of the materials have been supplied to educators, conference planners, researchers, state departments of education, and schools of education. Thousands of copies of awareness brochures and of the book *51% Minority*, a report of the Connecticut Conference, were distributed during follow-up conferences and in response to requests for information. Professional journals with which the project worked proved to be an excellent distribution medium. Project staff provided assistance to persons developing materials for national media such as *Sports Illustrated, Learning, American Education, Ms., Women Today, Phi Delta Kappan,* and *AAHPER Update.* The December 1972 issue of the NEA journal *Today's Education* ran a 12-page feature on sex role stereotyping in schools. Not only did this reach the 1.3 million NEA members, but in addition more than 15,000 reprints have been distributed during conferences and in response to information requests. Conference participants were instrumental in the development of articles that have appeared in more than 16 state and local publications. Reports from nine of the follow-up conferences will add to the general store of information developed as a result of the project.

A continuing problem in the development of materials was the need to speak to the concerns of nonwhite women. A few materials were identified or developed to meet this need, but it remains a priority for future work.

Materials development relating to the project continues through other sources. Members of Feminist Press are currently involved in producing materials for teachers, students, community persons, and administrators. The Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education also is developing materials for these groups. The NEA publishing unit is producing a multimedia kit of materials for in-service training. It is clear that the impact of the project will continue to be felt in the future.

OBJECTIVE IV

To Initiate Cooperative Dissemination Efforts Among Individuals and Groups

The fourth objective of the project was to stimulate other groups to undertake similar activities. In addition to the national conference and the distribution of materials, two other vehicles were used to meet this objective. One was the initiation of regular meetings of interested individuals and groups during the planning of the conference. Most of these represented national groups or constituencies. Those involved later formally organized themselves into the Coalition for Equal Opportunity in Education. The Coalition's primary function is to share information about common concerns and to provide a mechanism for continuing identification of persons with similar interests. Perhaps the most valuable outcome of this activity has been the initiation of regular contact among the individuals and groups involved in the Coalition.

A second means of "spreading the word" was through the follow-up activities after the national conference. Project staff provided direct or indirect assistance to 12 other conferences, helping with design and materials and providing speakers and workshop leaders. Conferences held to date include those in Boston, Massachusetts; Seattle, Washington; Portland, Bangor, and Presque Isle, Maine; Fort Wayne, Indiana; Hartford, Connecticut; Little Rock, Arkansas; Houston, Texas; Tallahassee, Florida; Austin, Texas; and New York, New York.[71]

Notes

1. Erik H. Erikson. *Childhood and Society.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1950.

2. Justin Aronfreed, *et al.* "Social Development." In *Developmental Psychology Today.* Delmar, California: CRM Books, 1971. p. 131.

3. Elizabeth Gould Davis. *The First Sex.* Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971.

4. Betty Levy. "The School's Role in the Sex-Role Stereotyping of Girls: A Feminist Review of the Literature." *Feminist Studies,* 1, No. 1, Summer 1972, 5-19. (Available from Feminist Studies, 417 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.)

5. Jerome Kagan. "Check One: ☐ Male ☐ Female." *Psychology Today,* 3, No. 2, July 1969, 39-41.

6. Daniel G. Brown. "Sex Role Development in a Changing Culture." *Psychological Bulletin,* 55, 1958, 232-42.

   William Ward. "Process of Sex-Role Development." *Developmental Psychology,* 1, No. 2, 1969, 163-68.

7. Aletha H. Stein and Jancis Smithells. "Age and Sex Difference in Children's Sex-Role Standards About Achievement." *Developmental Psychology,* 1, No. 3, May 1969, 252-59.

8. Ruth Hartley and Frances Hardesty. "Children's Perceptions of Sex-Role in Childhood." *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* 105, No. 21, 1964, 43-51.

   W. W. Hartup and S. G. Moore. "Avoidance of Inappropriate Sex-Typing by Young Children." *Journal of Consulting Psychology,* 27, 1963, 467-73.

9. Roberta Oetzel. "Annotated Bibliography." In *The Development of Sex Differences.* (Edited by Eleanor Maccoby.) Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966. pp. 223-322.

10. Selma Greenberg and Lucy Peck. Personal communication concerning yet unpublished research. Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York, 1973.

11. Joseph Katz. *No Time for Youth.* San Francisco: Josey Bass, 1968.

    John McKee and Alex Sheriffs. "The Differential Education of Males and Females." *Journal of Personality,* 35, No. 3, September 1957, 356-71.

    Shirley McCune. "Survey of AAUW Journal Readers." 1972. (Mimeo.)

12. Edward H. Pohlman. *The Psychology of Birth Planning.* Cambridge, Mass.: Shenkman, 1969.

13. Eleanor Maccoby. "Women's Intellect." In *The Potential of Women.* (Edited by Farber and Wilson.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

14. Everett Reimer. *An Essay on Alternatives in Education.* Cuernavaca, Mexico: CIDOC Guaderno No. 1005, 1970.

15. Levy, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

16. Nancy Frazier and Myra Sadker. *Sexism in School and Society.* New York: Harper & Row, 1973. pp. 71-73.

17. Eleanor Maccoby. "Sex Differences in Intellectual Functioning." *The Development of Sex Differences.* (Edited by Eleanor Maccoby.) Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

18. Patricia Cross. "College Women: A Research Description." *Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors,* 32, No. 1, Autumn 1968, 12-21.

19. Women's Equity Action League. *Facts About Women in Education.* (Available from WEAL, 1253 4th St., S.W.. Washington, D.C. 20024.)

20. S. Smith. "Age and Sex Differences in Children's Opinions Concerning Sex Differences." *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* 54, No. 1, March 1939, 17-25.

21. Robert O'Hara. "The Roots of Careers." *Elementary School Journal,* 62, No. 5, February 1962, 277-80.

22. Peggy Hawley. "What Women Think Men Think." *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 18, No. 3, Autumn 1971, 193-94.

23. Walter Slocum and Roy Boles. "Attractiveness of Occupations to High School Students." *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 46, No. 8, April 1969, 754-61.

24. Sara Zimet, editor. *What Children Read in School: Critical Analysis of Primary Textbooks.* New York: Grune and Stratton, 1972.

25. See Women on Words and Images. *Dick and Jane as Victims: Sex Stereotypes in Children's Readers.* (Available from Women on Words and Images, P.O. Box 2163, Princeton, N.J. 08540.)

    Lenore Weitzman, *et al.* "Sex-Role Socialization in Picture Books for Preschool Children." *American Journal of Sociology,* 77, May 1970, 1125-50.

    Marjorie B. U'Ren. "The Image of Woman in Textbooks." In *Woman in Sexist Society.* (Edited by Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran.) New York: Basic Books, 1971.

26. Lenore Weitzman, Dale Bustamante, and Diane Rizzo. "Sex Roles in Grammar School Texts." Presentation to the National Conference on Sex-Role Stereotyping, Washington, D.C., November 26, 1972.

Lenore Weitzman, *et al.* "Sex-Role Socialization in Picture Books for Preschool Children." Presentation to the American Sociological Association, Denver, Colorado, September 2, 1971.

27. Dolores Prida, Susan Ribner, *et al.* "Feminists Look at the 100 Books: The Portrayal of Women in Children's Books on Puerto Rican Themes." *Interracial Books for Children*, Spring 1972. Available from the Council on Interracial Books for Children, 29 West 15th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011.

28. Jean Dresden Grambs. "Sex-Stereotypes in Instructional Materials, Literature, and Language: A Survey of Research." *Women Studies Abstracts*, 1, No. 4, Fall 1972, 1-4, 91-94.

29. Sara Zimet. "Does Books Reading Influence Behavior?" Presentation to the Colorado Library Association Annual Conference, Intellectual Freedom Committee Program, Colorado Springs, December 9, 1972.

30. Agis Salpukas. "Survey of Textbooks Detects Less Bias Against Blacks but Little To Please Feminists." *New York Times*, March 28, 1973, p. 13.

31. Scott, Foresman, and Company. *Guidelines for Improving the Image of Women in Textbooks.* Glenville, Illinois, 1973.

Sullivan Associates. "Recommendations for Eliminating Sex-Role Stereotyping from a School Curriculum." Compilation from a workshop at Sullivan Associates, Menlo Park, California, October 1972.

32. Work of such groups as The Feminist Press, Box 334, Old Westbury, New York; KNOW, Box 86031, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Lollipop Press, P.O. Box 1171, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

33. Examples include the Berkeley Unified School District, California; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and Iowa City, Iowa.

34. James A. Banks, editor. *Teaching Ethnic Studies.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1973. p. 172.

35. National Education Association. *Checklist for Selecting and Evaluating U.S. History Textbooks.* Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1973.

36. New York Chapter of NOW. *Report on Sex Bias in the Public Schools.* 1972. (Available from NOW, 28 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.)

37. See Gail Bryan. *Discrimination on the Basis of Sex in Occupational Education in the Boston Public Schools.* Boston: Boston Commission To Improve the Status of Women, 1972.

38. Elizabeth Norris, National Board YWCA. "Feminine Figures 1972." (Available from Communications, National Board YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.)

39. James A. Banks. "Teaching Black Studies for Social Change." In *Teaching Ethnic Studies.* (Edited by James A. Banks.) Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1973. p. 172.

40. Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson. *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

41. Robert Spaulding. "Achievement, Creativity, and Self-Concept Correlates of Teacher-Pupil Transactions in Elementary School." Cooperative Research Project No. 1352, 1963, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

William J. Meyer and George S. Thompson. "Teacher Interactions with Boys as Contrasted with Girls." In *Psychological Studies of Human Development.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

42. Phil Jackson and Henriette Lahaderne. "Inequalities of Teacher-Pupil Contacts." In *The Experience of Schooling.* (Edited by Melvin Silberman.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971. pp. 123-34.

43. Frazier and Sadker, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-113.

44. S. L. Bem and D. V. Bem. "We're All Nonconscious Sexists." *Psychology Today*, 4, No. 6, 32-36, 115-16.

45. Patricia Bostrom. "Sexism in Washington State Public Schools' Sports Programs." Unpublished manuscript, November 11, 1972.

46. Marcia Fedderbush. *Let Them Aspire! A Plea and Proposal for Equality of Opportunity for Males and Females in the Ann Arbor Public Schools.* Pittsburgh: KNOW, 1971. (Available from KNOW, P.O. Box 86031, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15221.)

47. Unpublished study of competitive sports in the State College, Pa., School District. May be obtained from Patricia Sanders, Pennsylvania WEAL, 548 Hillside Avenue, State College, Pennsylvania 16801.

48. Dallas Women's Coalition. *A Study of Sex Discrimination in the Dallas Independent School District.* Dallas, Texas, June 1973.

49. Paula Latimer. *Survey of Sex Discrimination in the Waco Independent School District.* Waco, Texas, 1973.

50. Bostrom, *op. cit.*

51. Fedderbush, *op. cit.*

52. Bostrom, *op. cit.*

53. Celeste Ulrich. Remarks to Sex Role Stereotypes Conference, November 24-26, 1972.

54. Until 1973 the rules of the Division of Girls' and Women's Sports, AAHPER, prohibited women's acceptance of athletic scholarships.

55. National School Public Relations Association. *School Girl Pregnancy: Old Problem, New Solutions.* Washington: NSPRA, 1972. p. 1.

56. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-11.

57. Marion Howard. "Comprehensive Community Programs for the Pregnant Teenager." *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 14, No. 2, June 1971, 473-74.

58. *Ibid.*

59. Edwin Kiester, Jr. "The Bitter Lessons Too Many Schools Are Teaching Pregnant Teenagers." *Today's Health*, June 1972, p. 54.

60. Daisy K. Shaw. Testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, March 8, 1971.

61. As quoted by Marlene Pringle, "Counseling Women," ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Information Center, University of Michigan, Spring 1971.

62. *Ibid.*

63. Arthur Thomas and Norman Stewart. "Counselor Response to Female Clients with Deviate and Conforming Career Goals." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18, No. 4, 1971, 353-57.

64. Pringle, *op. cit.*

65. *NEA Research Bulletin*, 49, No. 3, October 1971.

66. Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott. *Staff Leadership in Public Schools.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Helen Morsink. "Leader Behavior of Men and Women Secondary School Principals." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1966.

67. Commissioner's Task Force on the Impact of Office of Education Programs on Women. *A Look at Women in Education: Issues and Answers for HEW.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November 1972.

68. Suzanne Taylor. "Leadership in Education: A Male Domain?" Presentation to The Educational Leadership Institute, New York, N.Y., April 24, 1973.

69. See Appendix A for list of organizations included in group consultations.

70. Seymour B. Sarason. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

71. For a detailed description of these conferences (sponsorship, theme, and contact person), see pages 60 and 61.

Section II

CONFERENCE REPORT

Why a Conference?

The original proposal for the project identified a national conference as the vehicle for achieving the project's objectives. The rationale for the conference included the following four points:

1. Primary leadership for changing sex role stereotypes was coming from multiple sources working largely in isolation from others with similar interests. A national conference could identify these groups and provide an opportunity for exchange of information.
2. Little published information about theoretical concerns or action strategies was available. The conference could provide a means of collecting data and evaluating strategies for dealing with sex role stereotyping.
3. Change in sex role stereotyping requires the combined efforts of teachers, administrators, students, parents, and community groups. The conference could provide a common focus for the involvement of representatives of each of these groups.
4. For change to occur it is necessary first to increase the general level of awareness and to demonstrate ways the problem can be dealt with. The conference format was intended as an educational vehicle for the participants and as a model for future conferences on the same problem.

Conference Theme

Conference planning sessions suggested the need to develop a common framework for viewing schools and understanding the ways in which sex role stereotypes are perpetuated. The conference theme, "Education for Survival," grew out of the conviction that the goal of education should be to prepare children for optimal physical, economic, political, cultural, and psychological survival. The survival needs of children differ according to sex, race, ethnic group, and social class. Schools must provide an education matched to the survival needs of the individual child. Equal opportunity cannot be served when identical education is provided for all children.

Five vehicles schools use to meet children's survival needs were identified in preconference planning sessions:

1. Curriculum (all the formal skills and knowledge transmitted to students)
2. Teacher behavior (the "hidden curriculum" of schools, comprised of teacher and administrator behavior)
3. Physical education and health education (activities intended to develop healthy bodies and positive body images)
4. Counseling (the sum total of activities that form the affective portion of the curriculum)
5. Extracurricular activities (the interface between societal expectations and the school experience).

A grid for analyzing how well each of these vehicles prepares children for political, economic, psychological/cultural, and physical survival was developed and used in designing the conference (see figure 1). The conference program (see Appendix C) was organized under the same general areas.

Figure 1

MODEL FOR ANALYZING HOW WELL SCHOOLS PREPARE STUDENTS FOR SURVIVAL

Adult Roles/ Survival Needs	Curriculum	Teacher behavior	Physical education Health education	Counseling	Extracurricular activities
Political survival					
Economic survival					
Psychological/ cultural survival					
Physical survival					

Conference Participants

A casual observer wandering into the Airlie Conference Center near Warrenton, Virginia, during the 1972 Thanksgiving weekend would have had difficulty guessing the purpose of the conference. More than 190 persons were involved in the various conference activities. (See Appendix F for list of participants.) Participants represented a spectrum of age groups, racial-cultural groups, and professional and occupational groups. Sixteen percent of the participants were male; 35 percent were members of racial and ethnic minority groups. Teachers, administrators, government employees, students, staff, and representatives of teacher organizations and community groups provided a lively variety of perspectives.

Leadership was shared. The "Conference Highlights and Reminders" in Appendix B lists major speakers and workshop leaders. The design of the conference had sought to bring together much of the national leadership with interest in this area. A problem was the lack of time for full utilization of all the talent present.

Conference Site

Airlie House, a conference center located in a beautiful Virginia country setting, was selected because it offered numerous small group meeting rooms and distance from the distractions of the city. Meals and most conference sessions were held in the main building of the center. Sleeping accommodations were conveniently located in nearby buildings.

Conference Activities

Speeches

The Conference opened with remarks by two NEA leaders, Margaret Stevenson and Samuel B. Ethridge, and a keynote speech by Louise White, director of the Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education. The conference had been planned to offer a variety of presentations. The primary framework was provided by a panel presentation on Education for Survival. Speakers on the panel were Elizabeth Koontz, then director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor; Celeste Ulrich, vice-president, American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; Michele Russell, Cummings Foundation; Florence Howe, Feminist Press; and Cecilia Suarez, National Chicana Foundation. Their speeches follow.

Small group discussions were used to help participants get acquainted and formulate questions to ask members of the panel.

"SEX ROLE STEREOTYPES"

(Keynote speech by Louise R. White)

I am reminded of a statement by a president of the League of Women Voters. She said, "I think there may be one thing more valuable than an idea in its time, and that is an idea in action, an idea made to work by the efforts of people working together, making a commitment and taking the concrete steps to bring the idea into effect."

Of the present 1,138,400 elementary school teachers, 961,500 are women. This is a fantastic resource for the furtherance of refined objectives, especially for the analysis of sex roles and forced stereotyped behavior. However, one quickly finds that eight out of ten principals are men. At the high school level the number of men and women teachers is about equal, but 97 percent of the principals are male. If these figures are valid, then we as women must share the brunt of perpetuating the differences in expectation and aspiration levels between boys and girls.

The day has passed when education can afford to stress specific learning roles according to sex. Today's educational system has taken on many of the features of a technological industry. We can assume that the process of educating people for survival is becoming the most important ingredient in our society as we move toward the twenty-first century.

Education in the past sought to prepare the individual for sex roles for working in an industrial and postindustrial society. This tradition, however, has given way to a new and more realistic one in which the education of the individual is a multipurpose task focusing on the *whole* child in the context of the *whole* society. We now educate the person, regardless of sex, to become more creative and productive.

Certain educational conventions still exist, however, that stereotype women and minorities by limiting interaction and by reinforcing beliefs about their lesser ability and value. These conventions constitute a negative "hidden curriculum" that shapes the interests and concerns of children from a very early age. By the time they are in the fourth grade, girls' visions of the occupations open to them are often limited to four: teacher, nurse, secretary, and mother. The self-fulfilling prophecy also exists within many classrooms. What the teacher expects is usually what the teacher gets. If she expects the girls to be quiet and nonassertive, the teacher generally gets quiet, nonassertive girls. If girls are expected to excel academically, they usually do. This is a very positive element in a classroom if a teacher has positive expectations, but when expectations include unquestioned obedience from girls, or poor academic performance from boys, such predictions become very harmful to the child.

One must also explore the facts and fictions of stereotypes. In a recent survey conducted by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, some sex differences related to attitudes were explained by the researchers as being the result of childhood socialization practices which "discourage the training of girls to work on their own." That research showed a significant difference

between men and women in their desires to be free to decide how to do their jobs. The men attached greater importance to such freedom. Also, women were less concerned than men about getting ahead on their jobs. Significantly more women than men said that they never wanted to be promoted. The study discovered that women's attitudes toward promotion were strongly tied to their expectations of being promoted.

Since these questions have serious implications for education, it would seem appropriate to examine those deficiencies that lead to human failure, and to begin to develop alternatives. Education should redirect itself to support the efforts of women and minorities to develop their potential fully and to utilize it.

As we deliberate during this conference, it is my hope that we will examine those conditions under which meaningful educational change can occur. Among the many possible ideas to consider, let me suggest at least three requisites for meaningful change:

1. Recognition that all intelligence does not originate at the university, but that some emanates naturally from within the community to form a richer hybrid of learning.
2. A "freeing of the atmosphere" by educators with respect to what skills go best with which sex. Survival is dependent upon enlargement of our own understanding of past achievement and progress. Life is dependent upon a more thorough search for alternatives that will include all people regardless of sex, race, or creed.
3. A search for ways in which NEA can continue to have impact on the activities of the U.S. Office of Education, with specific input toward shaping its activities.

We will have taken a giant step toward educating the children of our country for survival when the product of education becomes more important than the container, when the educational atmosphere has become flexible enough so that females can make educational choices without fear of being stigmatized, and when educators can admit that there are many unexplored avenues to educational development.

"EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL"

(Remarks by Elizabeth Koontz)

Prison uprisings, drug addiction, alcoholism, suicide, poverty, hunger, welfare, job dissatisfaction, unemployment, underemployment, campus unrest, political decision—what do these words bring to your mind?

Educators can do more about these problems than they realize by examining some of the schools' contradictions. Schools profess to promote equality of opportunity and the search for truth, with learning for living as one purpose. This must be examined in terms of processes, structures, practices, and the assumptions of educators, school boards, and parents.

The Women's Bureau was established 52 years ago at the instigation of women who deplored the conditions under which women and children were forced to work in factories. The Women's Bureau and the Children's Bureau were established by Acts of Congress.

Today we seldom hear of violations of the child labor laws, but only in recent years has concern been expressed about eliminating discrimination against women. What has brought this about? Two events have promoted the movement toward equal opportunity of the sexes: the influx of women into war industries during World War II, and the civil rights movement of the 60's. The youth culture has also played a significant role by changing life-styles for youth and adults.

Schools can be a vital change agent. But if individuals are to expect economic, psychological, cultural, political, and physical survival, the schools themselves must change. The attitudes of educators, school boards, communities, and politicians who control school funds must change. Curriculum, methodology, textbooks, policies and practices, and focus must also change.

Why such emphasis on the schools? Simply because the school system is the institution through which we expect all citizens to gain knowledge of the traditions, mores, and culture they are to perpetuate. If that system perpetuates biases and prejudices that limit development of one's self-concept and ability, it must be examined to ascertain the reasons for failure, and it must take corrective action.

Let's look at some of the problems:

Education is expensive and will grow more expensive in the future. People want to "get their money's worth." When you mention "welfare" you get different reactions. Much emotion accompanies expressions such as "taxing me to support those who won't work and live better than I," or descriptions of minorities as "lazy, shiftless, and not wanting to accept work." What contributes to this condition is the political process. What do schools have to do with this?

Schools prepare one to cope with the world in which he or she lives and will survive. Notice that I said "he or she." That's first. Our language can determine a whole chain of events, decisions, policies, and kinds of behavior. The implications become quite evident when generic uses of "he" become literal translations

for preferences, or for success or failure. Females make up more than half of the population, but we regard them as secondary in most instances, and schools reflect that status.

Schools *reflect* society to a greater extent than they *develop* society's attitudes. Although we have become an industrial country, we have not progressed much beyond the limited ideas about women assigned by the previous agrarian society. We still have "women's work" and "men's work," even though mechanization and automation have changed and virtually eliminated men's heavy and rough work. Parental care of children has been almost completely assigned to women as a carry-over from earlier days when women were required to work at home. Men worked outside the home to provide food, shelter, and fuel. Despite the fact that all male duties of the home have been so modernized that women can now take care of them, little has been done so that women can share the child-rearing responsibilities with men. *Herein lies most of the problem.*

Somehow our society has tied woman's role as childbearer to every other aspect of her personness. We determine from this fact our rationale for the following decisions:

1. Women should not be permitted to hold jobs traditionally performed by men, because families will break down if women work. That means women can cook, clean, plow, run tractors, repair machinery, drive cars, and haul children, groceries, or furniture, but they must not work at the same jobs for pay, or in competition with men.
2. Women should work at such jobs as nursing, caring for children, waiting on others, teaching, or in certain departments in factories. In industry that means women should stick to the jobs that have been broken down so that the pay could be reduced and women encouraged to take them.
3. Women should receive training only for those kinds of jobs associated with homemaking and improving their attractiveness unless, as during World War II, they are asked to do nontraditional jobs that pay well and include child-care facilities. That means women can do any kind of work when they are really needed. But when women need to work at better jobs, they should be protected against themselves and kept out of competition.
4. Every woman needs more protection than a man from certain jobs because a woman's contribution is made when she is a good wife and mother and cares for the family's needs, and when she is a noble servant. This means that a woman should get a man and bear children and take care of the home, for which she will be rewarded with care for the rest of her life and not need to worry about the problems of the world.
5. Woman is trained from birth to use her "femininity" to get her father's favors and copy her mother's ways. She is to sit still and look pretty while boys play rough games. She is rewarded for being quiet while boys are rewarded for being assertive. For performing her household duties she will receive compliments such as "I don't know what we'd do without you." This means women are supposed to wait on others who are grateful for not having to do anything that smacks of boredom, routine, and drudgery.

6. Girls attend school where decisions are made, and attitudes derived, on the basis of the roles they are expected to assume as adults. In nursery school both sexes learn which toys are for each, and that boys give the orders and girls take the orders. They learn that fathers go to work and mothers stay home and take care of the house and the children. Fathers know how to do many things, but mothers can only "mommy."

Throughout the grades, school books portray girls and women in the limited roles of housewife and mother, or performing at the orders of others, as passive, with no opinions of their own, and usually asking the males for opinions and answers. Girls are not supposed to have the brain power to do arithmetic. That is a man's subject. The girl learns from teachers and counselors that she should concentrate on getting married and being a good wife; therefore, studies are necessary just for getting a diploma. Learning to type is something to "fall back on" until she hooks that man. Boys are led to believe that they are superior at learning math, science, physics, and the solid subjects, and that only a sissy would be interested in learning to cook, sew, iron, or do hair.

The curriculum has reinforced myths that educators cannot explain rationally. You read or hear, "It is our philosophy that every person deserves the opportunity to develop to the full extent of his potential and ability." Therein lies the trouble. Remember the generic use of "he" or "his." Schools have predetermined what the potential is for a boy or a girl and have categorized all in each sex as being alike and completely different from those in the other sex.

Now it is time to look at reality. Fifty-one percent of the population is female, and women make up 38 percent of the work force. They receive earnings much lower than men's because of the kind of work they do, and because of discrimination in pay even when they do the same work. This is under attack now, and discrimination on the basis of sex is clearly illegal. Some 35 million dollars have already been awarded in back pay because of violations.

Women work because of economic need, not for fun and luxuries. Two-thirds of the women working are single, divorced, deserted, widowed, or married to men earning less than $7,000 a year. Women are heads of families. Of the 51 million families in the U.S., one out of nine is headed by a woman. Among minorities, this rises to four out of ten. And women work even when they have children under three years of age.

Only a small percentage of women are managers, or even skilled craftspersons. They are seldom doctors or lawyers. And though they are teachers, they are seldom principals or superintendents. Why? Mainly because of sex stereotyping that the schools permit and even perpetuate.

But stereotyping does not end there. The sex roles assigned by minority cultures prohibit women's economic independence because the majority culture has set forth certain characteristics for males and females based on myths.

One of these myths is that the wife does not work. This is not realistic. The fact is that the great middle class of this country exists because both husband and wife have worked for many years, and still do. But the myth persists, and the minority male suffers from the weight of what is prescribed in order to be called a "man." He must be able to support a family single-handed. Minorities in general need the combined incomes of all adults in the family to attain a decent level of existence. So do many families among the white majority, but the minorities do not know this.

Another proof of manhood is associated with the ability to produce children. This becomes part of the larger population problem when women are taught that bearing children is their greatest contribution. What will the schools train women for once the necessity for population control is widely accepted?

You might think of the needs of our society in urban planning, management of social institutions, crafts, services of all kinds, and ask, Why are we selecting from only a small segment of the society the ones to be trained, employed, or recruited for special responsibilities?

Do the schools know the needs for survival of the different sexes, or of different groups? Do the schools ignore some of the signals? The signals are prison uprisings, drug addiction, alcoholism, depression and mental illness, job dissatisfaction, divorce rates, underemployment and unemployment and their relationship to such crimes as prostitution, where the seller goes to jail and the buyer goes free. We need to ask what the schools might be doing about these problems and their causes.

If the schools hamper one's chances for survival, I don't believe it is intentional. Since it is happening, largely from ignorance, insensitivity, or unawareness, why not begin now the plans to do something about it all over this land?

Finally, we must ask what the schools are doing to make each individual feel good about herself or himself, even though our living conditions are the result of discrimination.

"EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC SURVIVAL"

(Remarks by Michele Russell)

To responsibily address the question of education for survival in an American economic context, it is necessary to first summarize the guiding principles and current organization of our economic environment. Those guiding principles, briefly stated, are—

1. The maximization of profit.
2. Perpetual economic expansion.
3. Rapid technological change.
4. The monopolization of decision-making power and material resources.

The human costs of such priorities are—

1. Wealth, consolidation, and internationalization at the top and poverty, division, and domestication at the bottom (where all of us are).
2. The instability which is the product of the necessity to constantly expand.
3. Extensive work force stratification, which is the structural solution to keeping technological innovation the property of small and carefully selected groups of people, and also becomes a primary way of substituting status for power and masking the fundamental class divisions which exist in this country. This stratification tendency, tailored to the demands of rapid technological change and the atomization of working peoples' consciousness, results in such phenomena as—
    a. Planned obsolescence.
    b. Job displacement through automation and industries moving abroad.
    c. Creation of new work categories to cool out dissent (e.g., paraprofessionalism).
    d. Widespread disenfranchisement.
    e. Narrowing notions of self-interest among the broad population.

In this society, "division of labor" equals stratification, specialization, and regimentation of tasks. "Development" is equivalent to rapid technological change, obsolescence, acceleration, and speed-up. "Success" means competitive individual upward mobility.

The elements in the educational system which socialize folk to "fit in," or survive, in fact, are precisely those things which we don't like. Divisions from one another which prefigure labor force stratification are maintained by the testing and tracking systems, which are racist, sexist, and class-biased. The dehumanization process is intensified by the rise in the educational technology of teaching machines and the managerial style of performance contracting. These are all things we point to very often when we are identifying the failures and negative aspects of educational experience. What we are slow to learn is that the ability of the school system to develop and protect these methods of instruction is an index of the *success* of the educational system in training students to accept and perpetuate the underlying irrational organization of the whole society.

In that context, when government and financial institutions talk about revitalizing the economy by "pursuing full utilization of human resources," they are not talking about changing the distribution of power in this country. They are not talking about eliminating racism, sexism, and class favoritism. When they talk about equipping the schools to "work effectively" with the "disadvantaged," they are not talking about liberating the nonwhite and female parts of the population from the traditional roles they have played in American society. They are simply talking about organizing our labor differently so as to more efficiently control, predict, and incorporate our energies into the mainstream of those guiding principles outlined earlier. The effects of this reality on Black men and on women of all races are extremely debilitating.

Black men are trapped in careers that are most prone to physical hazards, rapid turnover, or displacement. Those who are pushed out of school find themselves either in some branch of the armed forces, on the assembly line, or in the relief line—all of which guarantee a very short life. If a Black man is lucky and has some kind of professional white-collar training, he will find himself in an occupation that isolates him from everybody else. Alternatively, he will be tracked into a staff position in a large organization and will have nothing to do with defining how that institution is organized. He will have a showcase position, whether as an EEO person, a counselor, or an organizational psychologist, whose job is to rationalize his own continued isolation, everybody else's displacement, and the distance between himself and his Black brothers and sisters at lower levels of the economy. If socially minded, he might become a social worker or a parole officer (really, variations on the same theme). Then his job is explicit surveillance and informing on the most alienated and oppressed sections of the community—keeping them in a dependent relationship to the state apparatus, begging for enough autonomy to survive, but never given enough leeway to prevail over their misery.

If I were Frantz Fanon and this were Algeria, I would be talking about a "national bourgeoisie" or a "native class of colonizers" in the Black community who themselves are victims. Since I'm here in the United States, I can just talk about a professional Black elite whose status, comfort, and identity are dependent precisely on the effectiveness with which they keep other Black people down. That's one thing that happens to Black men when economic survival through career development is pursued without challenging the whole ideological basis of advancement and success in this society.

Women of all races undergo a different process in terms of being "useful" to the economic and social order. Women in the labor force are concentrated at the bottom of the system. The schools track women students into maintenance and socialization work—as cooks, maids, seamstresses, nurses, secretaries, and teachers—for which society does not pay well. We fill the most permanent, basic, necessary, and fundamentally stable jobs in the economy. But this economy is organized not to value those activities which are humanly necessary. When we predominate in an industry, such as textiles, the managers are men. Other occupations open to us are mainly in the social service sector or in "paper pushing." We are tracked as a group into work which maintains the smooth flow and the stability of the economy, not into expanding areas where there is room to grow. The characteristics

required for the jobs we do are those such as patience, physical endurance, low status-needs, acceptance of routine, which increase the tendency to keep us in our place. But these are the same qualities that help us survive. This is the reality that we live with.

If we are to commit ourselves to alleviating the major problems of American society and deal seriously with the contradiction of wide-spread poverty and disenfranchisement in an economy of abundance, we must be prepared to combat racism, sexism, and the class structure upon which America is based. Each of the groups who are without power, without secure prospects of economic survival, without equal access to the institutions which control our lives—each and all of us must begin by defining the task as the formation of a collective movement for a redistribution of all the priorities and a redefinition of the guiding principles of American society. Piecemeal solutions in the form of increased status, individual sinecures, and even the psychological lift that comes from positive cultural identity are, in the long run, insufficient to guarantee our collective survival.

The struggle for total redefinition begins at birth. The development of consciousness, itself, is a cradle-to-grave process. The consolidation of consciousness into institutional forms is our work. That's what we do as teachers. We must choose which life possibilities our institutions will mirror and commit ourselves to shaping them in that image. Our choices will determine the terms on which all of us are willing to survive and whether, in fact, we can prevail.

"BUT I AM MY BODY: SCHOOLS AND PHYSICAL SURVIVAL"

(Remarks by Celeste Ulrich)

Descartes suggested, *"Je pense, donc je suis"*; however, I would seek to convince you that "I am, therefore I think, and feel, and act." Schools, and even societies, have subscribed to the notion that the *real* person exists within a temple of muscles, nerves, and organs called the body, the preservation of which fosters survival. My survival depends upon the behavior I manifest as I reflect the doing, feeling, and thinking domains of the totality that is me.

The idea that "I am my body" is not easily accepted by the institutions of formal education, nor is the plea of physical educators that we must foster physical survival. Education, which has bowed to reason and idolized cognition, has only recently considered the totality of the individual and recognized that the learner must feel and do, as well as think. Only through such a holistic approach will relevant education be found.

Physical educators have always endorsed holism. As we have attempted to understand the art and science of human movement, we have depended heavily upon activity to sponsor feelings and understandings. But, because action and concern do not always stem from cognition, physical education has often been a stepchild of the formal school curriculum. The traditional curriculum has usually assumed the responsibility to reflect society as depicted through rational understanding.

Education is expanding and has already started to assume more societal responsibility. The schools, which reflect the social scene, also reproduce stereotypes of the real-life social drama. They overtly stereotype roles according to racial, religious, and economic patterns, and they covertly and malignantly stereotype persons by sex-oriented expectations. Sex role stereotyping has seldom been recognized, even by the individuals against whom it discriminates. It is a malignancy because it endorses the fallacious idea that over 50 percent of the world's population is to be treated as second class citizens—of less worth and of whom less is expected. The female has come to fulfill the prophecy that has been set for her.

The most highly valued American attributes are those reserved for the male. The research of Rosenkrantz, Broverman, Reisman, Griffin, Maccoby, Horner, and others has all demonstrated that traits identified as feminine are valued less than those considered masculine. The masculine image is considered synonymous with the image of the healthy adult person. We sanctify our reasoning via theories of biological determinism, historical revelation, God, male dominance, ego satisfaction, and personality development. Freud depicted the female as dependent, passive, fragile, nonaggressive, noncompetitive, empathic, sensitive, yielding, receptive, supportive, and emotionally liable. He depicted the male as independent, aggressive, competitive, task-oriented, assertive, innovative, self-disciplined, stoic, active, analytical, courageous, confident, rational, and emotionally controlled.

The terms used to describe the behaviors associated with masculine role fulfillment stem from concepts of physical strength and endurance—the two traits in

which the average male bests the average female. Gender-identified traits reflect relative values in strength and endurance, an abundance of which has always been assumed valuable.

Very little research is available about female strength and endurance. Evidence is accumulating, however, to show that the strength differential is greater within each sex than between sexes. A number of women are stronger than a great many men, and many men are less enduring than some women. The day may be approaching when a woman can aspire to values treasured for all healthy people without being considered unfeminine.

Many assumptions about the relative strength and endurance of men and women are based upon adult mean scores and may not apply to real boys and girls. The 100 best athletes from a school of 300 boys and 300 girls would contain a high percentage of females. Thus, the restrictions placed upon women in developing their fullest potential do not have a sound physiological rationale. Instead, they reflect a moral vendetta and stereotyped sex roles. The recent Olympics showed us women who are not ashamed to be strong. The Tibetan who climbed Mt. Everest with Edmund Hillary was a 90-pound, 18-year-old female who carried equipment weighing close to 150 pounds.

To ensure the idea that women must never get "out of hand," a determined effort has reinforced the weak and fragile concept of femininity. One ridicules the Amazons to teach what happens to girls whose muscles bulge and whose behavioral patterns cater to aggression and drive. To bulge from excess mammary tissue is one thing, but to bulge from muscular tissue is another. As females reinterpret their roles, they find out that strength and endurance are not unfeminine and that bulges can be controlled. Women who affirm their bodies are beginning to feel comfortable with assertive roles and with personality characteristics of strength.

Because the internalized feelings regarding strength and endurance are so basic to our interpretations of the stereotyped sex role, it would appear that departments of physical education might act as change agents within the schools. However, blatant sexual discrimination has been most rampant in departments of physical education. Phys ed is the only sex-identified body of knowledge in the school curriculum. (You do not have boys' math and girls' math, boys' English and girls' English.) Physical education facilities, equipment, and personnel for girls have been regarded as less important than those for boys.

Women who have allied themselves with physical activity have often had to risk their feminine image, and in a world where even bicycles have a sex, that is frightening. As some insecure males felt that sports—the last bastion of masculinity—was being stormed, they felt and acted as if they were being emasculated. Therefore, women, ever mindful of their responsibilities to boost the male, turned to the one activity pattern open—dance. They "took over" and stressed the physical traits of flexibility, agility, and coordination, which reinforced the womanly attributes of grace, poise, and beauty. Men began to find dance distasteful and felt feminized when forced into such a movement pattern. The personality of the male dancer is still the object of social derision.

Nowhere has the concept of the strong woman been more dramatically represented than in the Olympiad. Women have been forbidden to compete against men in all activities except equitation. However, even as the activities of women Olympic contestants were held in check by a social dictum that reinforced the idea of women as weak and nonenduring, the female athletes brought both strength and endurance to the activities. The male Olympic coaches lined the fences not believing when women athletes shattered records previously thought unattainable by men or women.

As young people insist, "But I am my body," more emphasis is placed upon self-actualization and the autonomy sponsored by physical survival. The boys and girls in today's schools are not nearly as "uptight" about sexually designated activity roles as were their parents and grandparents. Many girls do not feel unfeminine as they run, jump, climb, throw, and endure. More boys are turning to dance, synchronized swimming, and figure skating. Both participate in gymnastics, volleyball, softball, climbing, surfing, and a myriad of movement patterns that reflect an unbiased approach to the art and science of human movement. The "mod bod" is asexual.

Physical survival is the bedrock of self-actualization. Physical educators ache to help people examine reality directly and honestly—an approach that will ameliorate individual abilities even as it enhances society. As alternate life-styles become available, and we feel comfortable in believing "I am my body" without feeling that we have abandoned the stereotypes of intellectualism, scholasticism, and other gender-oriented "isms," the opportunities for economic, psychosocial/cultural, and political survival will be manifested in social self-determination. I am my body. *Je suis, donc je fais. Je pense et j'attends.*

"SEXUAL STEREOTYPES–PSYCHOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL SURVIVAL"

(Remarks by Cecilia C-R Suarez)

A stereotype can be defined as a generalization about a group or members of a group based on emotion or faulty judgment. Stereotypes have stifled and imposed certain restrictions upon people or groups of people. In addition, stereotypes of people or groups of people have hindered their full development to contribute in our society. For instance, the stereotype of the woman as being passive and wanting to stay at home has restricted and stunted her full potential. The Chicana, that is the Mexican American woman, carries a double burden when it comes to stereotypes. For not only is she discriminated against as a woman, but she is also discriminated against as a member of an ethnic group which has a long history of prejudicial treatment by the dominant society. These stereotypes have had harmful effects, not only on the Chicana, but also on her family.

A good example of the stereotype of the Chicana is the description of Chicana child rearing practices that have been traditionally ascribed to her. The importance of these descriptions is that many educational programs for Chicanos in operation today have used these descriptions as bases for the programs. These programs, usually termed intervention or compensatory programs, are supposed to intervene or compensate for the supposed poor home environment and inferior language and culture of the Chicano home. Child rearing can be defined as the interaction between parents and their children, their expressions, attitudes, values, beliefs, interests–the interactions representing the whole system of transactional experience in the home setting.

One type of stereotype in the area of child rearing practices is the one that lumps all low income families as the same. Ira Gordon, for instance, describes the so-called "disadvantaged" as being disorganized, having low levels of expectations and having disciplinary patterns which use force (verbal and physical). I would like to comment on the aspect of disorganization in the low income environment because this description is used by many authors. Coming from a family of eleven (I was the tenth of eleven children) my mother was so organized, that if she had not been this way, she would not have been able to put a meal on the table. And my family stress on organization is typical of large Chicano families. As for low levels of expectations, I know of no Chicana mother that does not want the best for her child and has the highest of expectations. Martin Deutsch and McVicker Hunt, whose studies came out in the mid-sixties, were main contributors to the theory of the disadvantaged, that is that the low income family's environment was supposed to be disadvantaged and deficient and the child coming from this environment needed special enrichment in order to catch up with the white, English-speaking, middle class child. Deutsch describes the middle class life as more likely to produce opportunities for the normal growth of the child. According to him, the slum conditions have a detrimental effect on the physical and mental development of the ghetto child. He paints a dismal picture of the low income family, one that furnishes few learning opportunities because the parents are unaware and unable to prepare the child for school and because the low income environment is lacking in intellectual stimulation. Hunt blames the low income child's environment for his academic failure. He specifically

criticizes the crowded living conditions and the slum environment. Although the research is not on the Chicano, it is applied to him as well.

Culture in the barrio may in fact be too stimulating for some of the insensitive researchers who view a culture that is different from theirs as inferior. First of all, the barrio residents' speech may be varied. They may be monolingual (speaking either Spanish or English), bilingual (speaking Spanish and English, Spanish and Calo—barrio slang—or English and Calo) or trilingual (speaking Spanish, English, and Calo). Our Spanish language is full of dichos, proverbs, just about one for any occasion. Children run home in the dark after hearing one of the many versions of the folktale, La Llorona (the Weeping Woman). The children play such games as La Tablita, Naranja Dulce, Limon Partido, and La Vibora. The barrio uniquely celebrates birthdays, saint's days, religious days and holidays. Who in a Chicano family cannot remember being awakened by the Mexican birthday song, "Las Mananitas?" Folk dances such as the Jarabe Tapatio (the Mexican Hat Dance), the "Chiapanecas," or "La Bamba" are part of our celebrations. Our music is rich and varied, from the flutes of the Yaqui Deer Dances, to the harps of the Veracruz music, to the stirring falsettos of the mariachis, to the music of today's Latin Rock bands—El Chicano, Santana, and Azteca. The corrido, the Mexican folk ballad, describes not only events, heroes and legends from the Mexican Revolution such as Adolita and Pancho Villa, but Chicano folk heroes such as Texas' Jacinto Trevino and California's Joaquin Murieta as well as contemporary Chicano heroes like Cesar Chavez and Ruben Salazar. No, our barrio environment is not lacking in stimulation—it is lacking in sensitive researchers who can relate to the Chicano culture. But tragically, the writings of the previously mentioned Hunt and Deutsch have been parroted again and again and have been the bases for many educational programs for Chicanos.

But there have been writings specifically describing the Chicano family. These writers have theorized that the Chicano child is deprived, disadvantaged and handicapped because of the child-rearing practices of the home, and of course the Chicana mother is to blame. One study that has been accepted as authoritative, and wrongfully so, has been Heller's *Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads.* Heller ascribes various attributes to the Chicano family, which she contends contribute to the delinquency of Chicano youth. She criticizes the Chicano upbringing as blocking advancement into the Anglo society by stressing values that hinder mobility; values such as family ties, honor, masculinity, living in the present, the stressing of courtesy and politeness. Heller claims Chicano parental love is not conditional, it is not dependent on the child's level of performance as compared with his peers. The child does not have a standard of excellence imposed on him. In addition, he is trained for dependent behavior (especially close to the mother), while the Anglo is trained for independent behavior. The indulgent attitudes of the Chicana mother tend to hamper achievement of the child. "This lack of making good," according to Heller, "is consistent with the theme of fatalism and resignation which runs through the M-A culture." Therefore, Heller's study describes the Chicano as being held down by the family, that the Chicano parents are the child's own worst enemy. And who is the person that deals more with the child—the mother. Therefore she is to blame. Another widely quoted writer, William Madsen, an anthropologist, describes the Chicano family in his book, *The Mexican American in South Texas.* Madsen claims that

the Chicano family is the main obstacle to the advancement of the child because of the strong family ties demanding that one put the family above the self. Madsen's description of the family roles is typical of many writers. He contends that as the child grows into middle childhood, the father avoids demonstrations of affection, but the mother remains close to the child. Sex and age determine the roles of the family members (older male children are more respected). Madsen goes to great lengths to describe the Chicana as being submissive and that the Chicana wife gratefully submits to physical abuse by the Chicano husband. The male is described as showing his machismo (his manliness) by having affairs. In the literature on the Chicana, sex roles are very clearly defined. There is usually an unquestioning acceptance of the masculinity or machismo cult concerning the Chicano male. The male is therefore labeled as one who has a tendency to male superiority and a dominance through multiple sexual conquests. And the Chicana is described as defenseless and submissive to the macho.

Another description of the Chicana which is a typical one that runs through the literature is in the book *The New Nursery School.* Nimnicht, McAfee and Mier in this book used many of the Martin Deutsch studies on "deprived" children as a basis for their nursery school program. The recipients of this program were Chicano children in Greeley, Colorado. The Chicano child is described as living in an environmentally deprived home, in a large family where the father may not be able to support his family. Therefore, the mother needs to go out and work, making her tired and worried with little energy or time left to devote to her children. Although this program is no longer in operation, the descriptions of Chicanos are typical of the programs that claimed that the Chicano was deprived and to succeed in school he must become an English speaking, middle class white.

I could go on and on in describing the literature on the Chicana, but I think you get the picture. The home, as described by the literature, is culturally deprived, linguistically disadvantaged, economically deprived, culturally deficient, etc. Nick Vaca, in his excellent article in the Chicano journal *El Grito,* reviewed the literature of the social scientists on the Chicano and concluded that the dominant social science theory is one that holds that the Chicano culture is composed of values that are detrimental to the child. Therefore, according to this theory, to succeed in school, the child must change his language and culture. In popularizing this theory, the social scientist, Vaca contends, used so-called scientific evidence to blame the cause of low academic achievement of the Chicano from the guilty institutions onto the Chicano. Many authors are now criticizing this theory. The culturally deprived theory, which is based on a hierarchical concept that one culture is superior to others, needs to be questioned and disclaimed.

Deprived, deficient, disadvantaged, submissive, disorganized, these are all descriptions of the Chicana and her child rearing practices. What does it mean to her? It means because of the differences in culture, she has been stereotyped as inferior, rather than what she is—culturally different. What does it mean to be labeled inferior? People learn who they are and what they are from how they have been treated by those around them. People develop feelings that they are liked, wanted, accepted from having been liked, wanted and accepted. To produce a healthy self, it is necessary to provide experiences in which individuals are

accepted. So what does it do to the Chicana who is told that she is not a good mother? This has deep psychological implications not only for the mother, but also for her children, who are in her care, especially her daughters.

For the Chicana, being stereotyped as inferior because she comes from a culture that is not Anglo English-speaking middle-class means that she has to refute these stereotypes for her psychological and cultural survival. Her child rearing practices should not be deemed inferior because they are different. For too long minority groups have been attributed a subordinate status because "authorities" argue that one cultural tradition is better than others. Our society and specifically education must appreciate the various cultures that are part of our heritage. The concept of cultural pluralism, that is providing the student the opportunity to retain his language and culture while at the same time learning English, is an essential philosophical basis for any educational setting which serves Chicano children.

In addition, the Chicana, because of stereotypes, is not considered for any occupations except menial jobs. For isn't she inferior, unable to teach her children, unable to inspire them? The majority of Chicanas now employed are in the lowest paying jobs, such as migrant farm laborers and power machine operators. When I was going to college, for instance, my sisters were the most supportive of my getting an education. "We don't want you to work in sweat shops as we had to" they would tell me. The stereotype of the Chicana to work in only the lowest of jobs also has to be refuted. The bilingual-bicultural talents are a great asset and she should be allowed to develop them, in addition to all her other talents.

And what about the Chicana's family, especially her daughters? In schools, they are usually considered for vocational education. The Chicana is not considered for occupations such as a scientist, lawyer, historian, etc. In fact, Chicanas are usually counseled as non-college material—for aren't they going to get married right away and have many babies? Counselors and teachers should not have low expectations of the Chicana, but encourage her to go to college and get the full benefits of education.

The Chicana has many strengths that have been overlooked. The Chicano family, despite poverty and discrimination, has been a close family unit, mainly because of the mother. The strong force in the home has been the mother. Chicano children grow up revering and loving their mothers. But this respect is one that has been earned and one that lasts a lifetime despite the passage of time and long distances.

On the positive side, Chicanas are emerging into leadership positions. Alicia Escalante, in Los Angeles, as head of the National Chicana Welfare Rights Organization, is battling for better conditions for the welfare mother. In Delano, California, headquarters of the National Farmworkers Union, Dolores Huerta holds one of the highest positions in the organization. Marta Bustamante, in Sacramento, California, is organizing the low income and welfare mother. Las Mujeres de Bronce, a Chicana organization in San Pedro, California, was recently formed by Patricia Duran. In Michigan, Jane Gonzales is working with the Chicanas.

Teresa Aragon de Shepro, as Assistant Provost for the University of Washington, is an inspiration to all Chicanas. A sociologist from U.C.L.A., Deluvina Hernandez has written an excellent monograph, *Mexican American Challenge to a Sacred Cow*, a critique on the research on Chicano high school drop-outs in East Los Angeles. Lilia Aceves heads the recently funded Chicana Service Center in East Los Angeles, the first of its kind in the nation. Hope Lugo, a former Head Start mother, is now the director of the Napa County Economic Opportunity Commission which distributes anti-poverty funds in Napa County, California. Lupe Anguiano has worked for the Chicana through federal agencies in Washington, D.C. Some Chicanas have run for elected office: Rhea Mojica Hammer in Chicago, Margarita Castro in San Diego, and Marta Cortero in Crystal City, Texas. In Los Angeles, Silvia Castillo and Ana Neito-Gomez have developed a Chicana anthology. The National Chicana Foundation, comprised of university women throughout the United States, is devoted to research on the Chicana. Chicana classes are now emerging on many college campuses—U.C.L.A., U.C. Irvine, U.C. Berkeley, California State University at Northridge, and California State Polytechnic University at Pomona.

The time has come to look at the Chicana for what she is. She is not inferior, she is different. What is deprived about being different? The stereotypes of the Chicana must cease. She is an individual and a member of a rich culture, who must be treated as such. Then and only then will the Chicana reach her full potential. The stereotypes of the Chicana must be torn down by society accepting and appreciating cultural differences—not by attempting to obliterate them.

"SCHOOLS AND POLITICAL SURVIVAL"

(Remarks by Florence Howe)

The Feminist Press is a tax-exempt institution that publishes educational materials to change schools, especially for the sake of the education of women. We are engaged in several educational projects, including a series of community workshops on children's books in Holyoke (Massachusetts), New York, and Baltimore under a Rockefeller Family Fund grant. We are also conducting in-service teaching in New York City's public schools. We also publish a variety of materials through a clearinghouse on women's studies, including a Women's Studies Newsletter.

One of the main points that has been made at this conference is that sexism is intrinsically linked to racism. I think that's perfectly true. It is impossible for a white woman to work as a white woman for the sake of white women. For the women's movement to continue as a white women's movement is to fly in the face of reality and to be led into the same traps that our 19th century ancestors were led into. I am also concerned about classism. The women's movement must address white working class women as well as American Indian, Asian, Black, Chicana, and Puerto Rican women.

When we talk about minority group women we must be clear about including working class women as well as the poor. If we have begun to reach Black women, of if Black women are joining us, they are by and large professionals. If they are speaking up for their sisters who are not professionals, that is great, but I don't always hear that.

Unless we are clear about racism, we can't deal with sexism. I have taken a long time in coming around to that position, but I have come to it in part through teaching at Old Westbury, where some of the experience is enough to turn a liberal into a racist. Some of the experience is that difficult and unpleasant. I am happy to say I wasn't a liberal in the first place, so I don't suppose I am going to wind up a racist. But I think it is very difficult for white people who have been quite unconscious of their racism, or even who have been conscious of their racism, to be faced by hostility from Black people and from Puerto Rican people. To some extent it is deserved, but very often the people who face the hostility are not necessarily the people who deserve it.

I have been living recently in an environment very different from any that I have lived in before. During my two summers in Mississippi I was welcomed by the Black communities—an experience not comparable to that at Old Westbury where 30 percent are white—and it is a very educational experience for white people to be in a minority environment. Of course Black people and Chicanos understand what that means, but at Old Westbury they are the majority, and to some extent they act the way white people act when they are the majority. It is a very interesting thing.

I have learned about the necessity to come to grips with racism and sexism by teaching a women's studies course this term. I'm right in the middle of it, and I'm hoping that I can finish the semester without its going to pieces.

When I came into this classroom eight weeks ago to teach "Introduction to Women's Studies," I expected to find white women, because Black people at Old Westbury have largely been hostile to the idea of women's studies. Well, more than half the students in the class were Black women, and of course my curriculum went out the window. The course has been different from any course I have ever taught.

What is clear to me now is that Black and white women talk over each other's heads. They don't know what each other's lives are like, and they don't even begin to communicate with each other on the subject for a long time. It took many weeks before the women were willing to say that they don't trust each other. They may be friends; they don't want to be segregated; they don't want separate classes; but they don't trust each other. They don't trust each other about intimate matters, for instance, because they don't believe the other group can understand what their problems are, or their experiences, or their views.

I am not saying we can build bridges to understanding, if by bridges you mean the elimination of differences. We can communicate what the differences are about and how they feel, and we can appreciate the differences. It seems to me that this is the first step to political survival for all of us, not only in community relations or conferences but in the schools.

What has happened in my classroom may be a paradigm. We have not been able to talk much about sexism, or we can talk about it for only half the class period. I talk more with the Black students, though I don't really know that I'm doing it until the next day when I suffer white backlash. I know I divide my attention, but I don't know how to stop because I know of no way to talk both to Black and white students about some subjects. Michele Russell assisted in my class and was marvelous because she could do the reverse of what I do.

In addition to its interracial composition, half the people in my class are lower or working class. A few are upper or upper-middle class, and a couple are upper-upper. We also have three generations of women in the class, the age range being 17 to 60 years, and some students have as many as eight children. There are about four youngsters aged 17 to 22 who are beginning to resent being called the "young people" in the class, but they really are somewhat different from the rest.

How do we deal with the issues of racism, sexism, and classism? We manage it by becoming a bit more sophisticated all the time, and a bit more knowledgeable about the issues. Also, we need to go beyond understanding to analysis. Until you have a history, you have no future. Until we understand where sexism and racism, our problems and illnesses, come from, we will not know how to solve them. It's much more than knowing they exist. It's knowing where they came from and of what use they are to this nation.

We can't abolish sexism by saying we are going to abolish it, just as we can't abolish race prejudice by fiat. We have to work toward their elimination every single day, especially in the classroom. In whatever system we work, however complex or horrendous, there is always a entering wedge—a place that is susceptible to

change. Sometimes the change isn't enough to suit us, but if we are interested in change at all, we have to keep trying to find entering wedges.

I think the single most important entering wedge toward combatting racism and sexism is teacher education. More than 1,000 women's studies courses are being taught in colleges and universities all over the country; only about six of these are in schools of education. Why is it that schools of education are so intransigent? What about school systems? How difficult it is to change school systems! We all know about that. I haven't given up on schools of education, but I feel that we must reach teachers quite massively at other levels, too, through in-service courses, teachers organizations, and the women's movement.

How do we reach women teachers and what do we do once we get to them? One route is the women's studies route. The in-service courses conducted in New York City schools by the Feminist Press are very token efforts. Many school systems have paid staff to run in-service courses for their teachers. In some states, such as New York and Pennsylvania, guidelines for women's studies programs have been adopted by the board of regents or the state commissioner's office. This is another entering wedge. Guidelines are powerful instruments, but they need to be handled by people who care. The entering wedge in New York State is a guideline that says ending sexual stereotypes in the elementary and secondary schools is the aim of the Board of Regents. This means that teachers can demand in-service training of the sort they need in order to educate their students.

Now, what do we do in courses with teachers? Some people are worried that women's studies courses will simply allow the rest of the curriculum to go on as is. When the budget is cut, women's studies courses disappear.

One type of women's studies is called "Images of Women in Literature," what I would call compensatory education. It's like the courses in Black literature, some of which have gotten lopped off. Some Black literature courses have a lonely existence among 40 other lily-white courses in the department. That is not progress. A course in Black literature one year should lead to some consciousness raising among students and faculty so that next year every literature course contains some Black literature. If that doesn't begin to happen, then the Black literature teachers are not doing their job, or are prevented from doing it because of political factors. I would say the same thing to women.

The second type of women's studies course, the anthropological type, is what should fill in-service programs. If you were studying anthropology, you would look at foreign cultures and societies from all possible angles—economic, psychological, intellectual, etc., which is precisely what some women's studies courses are doing with regard to women. They look at women and men, deal with sex role socialization and stereotyping, and teach about how we grow up female or male in this country.

The other way to reach women teachers is through the production of materials. It is possible to produce a set of materials, send them to the school teacher, and

say, "This is what you teach this year instead of what you taught last year." This is not useful, although I think that we will go this route in five years.

The production of materials alone will not change school systems unless the women's movement is greatly strengthened and the consciousness of teachers is so altered that they can and want to use the materials. To some extent the Feminist Press was founded on the premise that some teachers are ready for and want new materials.

The best model is to work with teachers in small groups to raise their consciousness levels about sex and race and to give them both new information and new materials. We need to inform teachers that the real goal is to help them choose materials and then design their own classes. A year is essential to do this. During the second part of the year, teachers should work in groups to design curriculum units. Then they should try out the units in their classrooms, which, ideally, should be visited by the workshop leader. This would mean released time for that teacher. Whether or not that is possible, the teachers can still use the workshop members as a support after having tried out their curriculum units.

One would imagine that women teachers could meet as a group for an extra hour after school, but this has never happened since it's not built into the consciousness of teachers. Faculty and staff meetings in most elementary and high schools don't stimulate teachers to want further meetings, but this is an essential route for survival. Where schools are staffed by American Indian, Asian, Black, Chicana, and Puerto Rican women, the teachers meeting or workshop will have to begin with the issue of racism and deal with the hostility that is built into our culture before the discussion can turn to the lives of our children, which are, of course, what I think we are all interested in.

Workshops

Twenty different workshops were provided during the conference to encourage active involvement of the participants. Time was also made available for nonscheduled meetings of those sharing particular interests. The scheduled workshops included—

Education Association Involvement—Cora McHenry and Kate Kirkham. An examination of things education associations can do to reduce racial and sexual stereotypes in schools.

Racism and Sexism—Michele Russell. An analysis of racial and sexual stereotypes that affect our behavior.

Analyzing Instructional Materials—Sara Zimet. How to analyze textbooks and instructional materials for stereotypes.

Nonsexist Early Childhood Education—Norah Alemany. Ways to reduce sex stereotyping in early childhood education.

Consciousness-Raising Techniques for Changing Schools—Rogie Bender and Joan Bartl. Ways to spread the message to others.

Curriculum for Teachers—Florence Howe. Practical ways teachers can learn nonsexist education content and techniques.

Institutional Sex Role Stereotyping—Gail McLure and John McLure. Outline of a systems approach for change.

Students and Sex Role Stereotyping—Claire Fulcher. Programs for meeting student concerns and needs.

Community Involvement—Naydene Paysoure. A look at how community groups can foster change in schools.

Happenings in Your Head—Verne Moberg. Ideas for raising awareness of sex role stereotypes.

Women in Education—Suzanne Taylor. Status of women in the education profession.

Use of Media for Community Action—Anne Grant. Demonstration of multimedia techniques for increasing community awareness.

Experience Based upon Career Exploration—Jan Birk and Faith Tanney. Helping high school girls plan their careers.

Identifying and Changing Our Own Sexist Behavior with Children—Betty Levy. How we transmit sex stereotypes to children in the classroom, and how to stop.

High School Curriculum—Cynthia Eaton and Carol Jacobs. A model of women's studies for high schools.

Affirmative Action for Education—Althea Simmons. Writing affirmative action plans for school systems and institutions.

Legal Tools To Fight Sex Discrimination—Charlotte Hallam. Existing legislation that prohibits sex discrimination in schools.

Women's History—HerStory—Martha Gershun. Social studies curriculum for high school students.

Media Presentations

Five media presentations were given at intervals during the conference:

"Sex Role Stereotypes in Textbooks" (a slide show by Lenore Weitzman). Ms. Weitzman has studied reading, science, spelling, and math textbooks used in schools throughout the U.S. This well documented slide show graphically demonstrated the prevalence of sex role stereotyping in textbooks and other instructional materials.

"Free To Be You and Me" (nonsexist record presented by Letty Pogrebin). The Ms. Foundation had just completed the development of this record. Ms. Pogrebin told of Marlo Thomas' leadership in the development and production of the record and played portions of the material for the audience.

"Sex Stereotyping in Children's Readers" (a slide show by the Women on Words and Images). The Women on Words and Images have provided national leadership in their study of children's readers. This slide show presented some of their findings and demonstrated techniques for raising consciousness.

"Our North American Foremothers" (a slide show by Anne Grant). Ms. Grant spent months researching the historical contributions of North American women. This slide presentation of her findings demonstrated a most effective method of supplementing present curriculum materials.

"Dick and Jane" (a slide show by Corrine Perkins). Ms. Perkins, a teacher in Iowa City, Iowa, demonstrated how teachers can conduct their own studies of textbooks and use them as effective methods of in-service training.

These presentations provided important content for the conference and demonstrated the variety of ways in which awareness can be increased.

Participant Reactions

Toward the end of the conference an evaluation sheet was distributed, on which participants were asked to comment on any aspect of the conference and to give their overall reaction.

Here are some excerpts from the comments:

- The sense of openness in the conference—the availability of the leaders, the speakers, the "stars" for talk at breakfast, lunch, and dinner—was refreshing and something you should bottle and sell to all other conferences . . . . I have one complaint. There were two or more workshops I wanted to attend, but could not because they all took place at the same time . . . . I think this conference may be a germinal one from which we will count time hereafter.
- The speakers and the resources for this conference were excellent. The workshops lacked in depth and did not deal with the underlying social and economic sources of racial and sexual oppression. My concern is that people are not aware of their power. The only way society is going to change is if people are aware that they can take control over their own lives.
- Some free associations: Very exciting—feel saturated with ideas, all pragmatic. Received concrete notions for my women's studies course. This conference should be yearly.
- An issue which was raised but not followed up was the issue of *class* struggle which is cross-racial, cross-sexual, and has an important impact on sex role stereotyping.
- I was somewhat disappointed because more practicing teachers were not in attendance. However, it was a transfusion and rededication.
- The workshops that I attended were very helpful in terms of information, but I think the conference could have prepared a list of action activities in advance for discussion in a general session.
- Personally I need to know what local coalitions of powerless minorities and women have found out about common needs and what has been done jointly that worked.
- No attention paid to working class needs; focus seemed to be on how to get women to achieve and star.
- A good start; hopefully action on many of the ideas will be forthcoming.
- I have a strong desire to move into "doing" activities to eliminate sexist practices on all levels of schooling. In bringing the participants together, the conference has established a critical mass. Action activities should be the next step.
- I feel a need for follow-up activities; to know who was here and what they're working on, and to devise an agenda for actively dealing with sex bias in schools.
- Why not take a slide show such as Ms. Weitzman's and produce it for a television documentary?
- There is a need for training in how to deal with resistance and hostility and the realities of organizing. Hope NEA makes some strong official statements.

- I came for a specific purpose: to find material to use to teach a women's history course at the high school level. I did find many good sources. I was also stimulated by the personal contacts with some very dynamic people.
- I feel the focus should have been on students and the elementary and secondary curricula. The workshops in these areas did not supply the needed output to effectively mediate change.
- The workshops I attended on early childhood education and high school curriculum were too much focused on reading and activities. I would like to have seen more awareness of the blatant sexism in health education and sex education materials.
- I leave the conference awed by the amount of work being done by people all over the country.
- My consciousness level has been marvelously raised. Out of a vague sense of dissatisfaction with sexism and racism, a sense of direction for action has come.
- Humanism should be used along with racism/sexism. Florence Howe's presentation gave me some directions and a lot of hope.
- The feminist movement must be careful to work with ethnic minorities and all classes of people. I saw too much of "I'm more oppressed than you" during this conference.
- I was pleased to hear Shirley McCune say the first day to be careful and not put your audience on the defensive.
- The greatest benefit came from meeting and conversing with educated, intelligent women.
- The whole human relations aspect of the conference was extremely rewarding, and I am enthusiastic about the main idea of pulling together all the diverse groups to work together toward the goal of treating people as individuals . . . . I think I was the only person representing a state Commission on the Status of Women. These commissions are the legitimate arm of state governments dealing with the problems of women.
- The conference gave me contact with creative people, exposed me to novel and stimulating ideas, and acquainted me with excellent resources.
- I would like to see sample program tools developed for immediate use. For example, (1) a six-session in-service training program for elementary school teachers; and (2) a complete program for one high school course in family living.
- Many issues raised were not resolved, but I saw the function of the conference to raise issues that must be addressed in the future.

In summary, most comments were complimentary about the speakers, the resources, the facilities, and the general organization of the conference. The most frequent criticisms concerned the repetitive aspects of the media presentations and the lack of opportunity to attend more of the workshops. Some participants came with higher expectations than a three-day conference could meet. In general such people recognized the practical limitations imposed by the time factor.

State and Local Conferences

Impact of the national conference is still being felt. To date, project staff have assisted a total of 12 similar conferences with planning, materials, or implementation. Three more conferences are scheduled for fall 1973. Those held to date include:

Washington Education Association, Seattle, Washington, March 15-17, 1973

The Human Relations Commission of the WEA sponsored a conference on Racism, Sexism, and Classism in Education. Sex bias concerns were a major focus. Highlights of the conference included the development of action plans for continuing work to change opportunities for minorities and women, and the organization of a group that will be implementing these plans. Contact: Paul Tanaka, 2000 Tacoma Mall, Suite 6-36, Tacoma, Washington 98409.

Boston Conference, March 24, 1973

Mayor Kevin White's special assistant for educational affairs, Robert Schwartz, initiated a conference with the cooperation of the Massachusetts State Department of Education, the Boston Teachers Union, the Massachusetts Teachers Association, and the National Education Association. The one-day conference drew more than 300 participants and has sparked numerous follow-up activities. A report of the conference is being developed. Contact persons: Cecelia DiBella and Cathy Minicucci, Massachusetts Department of Education, 182 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111.

Maine Conferences (Portland, Bangor, and Presque Isle), April 10-12, 1973

The Maine State Department of Education initiated a series of three conferences to increase educators' awareness of sex discrimination and the need to modify curriculum and administrative policies. The Maine Superintendents Association and the Maine Teachers Association served as cosponsors for the conferences. Contact: Shirley Ezzy, Maine State Department of Education and Cultural Services, Statehouse, Augusta, Maine 04330.

Fort Wayne, Indiana, April 15, 1973

The Fort Wayne Education Association sponsored a conference on Values and Curriculum Concerns. One of the areas highlighted was the relationship between values and sex role stereotypes. Contact: Marvin Ross, ISTA, 1520 Spy Run Avenue, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805.

Teacher Leadership Program, New York City, April 23-26, 1973

A three-day program for leaders of teacher organizations was sponsored by the Teacher Leadership Program, which is administered by the Office of Teacher Education, City University of New York. The focus of the conference was the educational implications of the sexual revolution, the feminist movement, changing sex roles, and discrimination against women in education. Contact: Myron Lieberman, Teacher Leadership Program, CUNY, 1411 Broadway, New York, New York 10018.

Arkansas Conference, Little Rock, Arkansas, May 5, 1973

A conference was sponsored by the Governors Commission on the Status of Women, the Arkansas Department of Education, the Arkansas Education Association, and the University of Arkansas Chapter of the Commission on the Status of Women. The one-day conference initiated the exploration of how citizens and educators can work to eliminate sex role stereotyping. Contact: Cora McHenry, AEA Building, 1500 W. 4th Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201.

Florida Education Association, Tallahassee, Florida, May 11-12, 1973

A two-day conference sponsored by the Florida Education Association probed the ways that citizens and educators can reduce sex role stereotyping in schools. Analysis of pending legislation and the involvement of women's groups highlighted the conference. Contact: Molly Sample, Florida Education Association, 208 W. Pensacola Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32305.

Houston, Texas, May 12, 1973

A task force on education, sponsored by WEAL, Houston NOW, Galveston NOW, YWCA, and Houston Teachers Association, held a one-day workshop to examine sex stereotypes in schools. The group will continue to work with statewide groups in developing action. Contact: Gertrude Barnstone, P.O. Box 2222, Houston, Texas 77001.

Texas Conference, Austin, Texas, May 18-20, 1973

A statewide conference coordinated by Jane Wells and Jane Hickey of the State Board of Education was directed to developing action plans for reducing sexism in elementary and secondary schools. A coalition made up of individual leaders worked with the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Classroom Association in sponsoring the conference. As a result of the conference, 110 persons are now involved in the continuing work of the task force. A conference report is available. Contact: Jane Hickey, 6921 Thorncliffe, Austin, Texas 78731.

Connecticut Education Association, May 19, 1973

The second CEA Conference focused on the legal tools for combating sex discrimination and the variety of ways that sex discrimination manifests itself in elementary and secondary education. The primary focus of the conference was to develop action strategies for reducing sex role stereotypes. A report of the Conference will be available. Contact: Suzanne Taylor, Connecticut Education Association, 21 Oak Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06106.

Follow-Up Evaluation

After a six-month interval, a follow-up questionnaire was circulated to all participants to see how they evaluated the conference itself and to discover what ways the conference had influenced them. The 25 responses received by June 15, 1973, are summarized below:

- The most frequently mentioned motivations for attending the conference were to *establish communication* and to *gather information.* These goals were fully realized by 92 percent and partly realized by 8 percent.
- The quality of the main speakers was rated as good to excellent by 96 percent and poor by 4 percent.
- The workshops were considered good to excellent by 87.5 percent and poor by 12.5 percent.
- The quality of conference materials was rated good to excellent by 100 percent.
- Facilities and arrangements were rated under four subdivisions: *housing and food*—98 percent good to excellent; *transportation*—75 percent good to excellent; *informal discussions*—90 percent good to excellent; and *social opportunities*—62.5 percent good and 37.5 percent less than good.

Respondents mentioned a variety of ways the conference could have been improved:

. . . Provide for more informal discussions, hospitality, and free time.

. . . Hold state group meetings and emphasize action back home.

. . . Repeat workshops and distribute workshop handouts to total group.

. . . Provide more in-depth involvement in fewer areas, and add problem-solving exercises.

. . . Have fewer slide shows with more polished and condensed content.

. . . Hold meetings in Washington, D.C., and have telephones in rooms.

. . . Stick to elementary-secondary problems in sexism/racism and supply more follow-up information.

. . . Provide better transportation.

Asked how the conference influenced their perception of sex-role stereotyping in schools, more than 50 percent of the respondents reported expanded personal awareness and reinforced perceptions. For some, the conference pointed up the difficulties involved in changing attitudes.

The conference stimulated follow-up activities in numerous ways. Typical follow-up activities reported by respondents included increased crossovers to other organizations to spread the message on sexism/racism through speaking, writing, research, and exchange of resources; clarification of goals and priorities and development of concrete methods for change; and the sharing of conference experiences with colleagues, including teachers, students, administrators, and school boards. To some participants the major new direction suggested by the conference

was legal action to enforce equal rights, particularly under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

There is evidence from the follow-up questionnaire that the conference materials were reproduced independently and distributed widely in schools and beyond, to newspapers, periodicals, speakers, writers, and researchers. More than 300 copies of the materials were distributed to nonparticipants by NEA.

Respondents were asked to report postconference experiences that either encouraged or discouraged further activities. Among the encouraging items were good attendance at state conferences on sex role stereotyping; programs at professional conventions (APGA, APA, ASCD, AAHPER); increased flow of information within states on sex stereotyping and sex discrimination, including more open discussion of the topic among educators; individual pursuits of (a) Ph.D. program in sex roles and (b) development of guidelines for equal opportunity in athletics. Participants reported discouragement about failure to pass the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) in their states; state legislators who cloud the issue with such things as women pickets or "bra burning"; state human relations departments that ignore sexism and focus only on racism; resistance to change by "protectors of the system"; hostile reaction of school boards; the feeling among teachers that the problem is too big to cope with; and women who shy away from administration and positions of authority in education.

Services that the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education could provide, as seen by respondents, were a newsletter through which to share data and experiences; specific materials for workshops; guidelines for assessment of sexism; research in sex discrimination and sex differences; teaching materials such as mini-courses for high schools; bibliographies of nonsexist textbooks and other resources; films and slide shows for distribution; regional lists of speakers and leaders for meetings, workshops, and conferences; and current data on legislation and court cases. Many participants expressed interest in contributing information and articles for publication and distribution by the Resource Center. Some also offered to serve as consultants.

Suggestions for "the next step for action" showed similarity in major priorities, while reflecting differences in local or state situations. Several respondents mentioned the need for legal action and for enforcement of antidiscrimination laws. In the many states where legal action by teachers to counter sex discrimination is just beginning, this is a first priority. Respondents from states where legal action has proved its effectiveness gave higher priority to other approaches, such as curriculum reform. Several cited the need for publicity to influence educators and the general public. Reforms in curriculum, textbooks, counseling, teacher education, and school administration also were considered important. Some respondents emphasized the need to develop a data bank of research on issues related to sex discrimination.

Three of the "other comments" the evaluation forms elicited are of special interest:

- "Teachers are the key . . . ."
- "A girl should be educated to appreciate herself."
- "Children should be encouraged to write about their own sex roles."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Organizations Included in Group Consultations

1. American Association of University Professors
   Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession
2. American Association of University Women
3. American Chemical Society
   Women Chemist's Committee
4. American Federation of Teachers
   Women's Rights Committee
5. American Friends Service Committee
6. American Historical Association
   Committee on the Status of Women
7. American Library Association
   Task Force on the Status of Women
8. American Personnel and Guidance Association
9. American Political Science Association
   Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession
   Women's Caucus for Political Science
10. American Psychological Association
    Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology
11. American Sociological Association
    Committee on the Status of Women
12. American Speech and Hearing Association
    Subcommittee on the Status of Women
13. Association of American Colleges
    Project on Status and Education of Women
14. Association for Women in Mathematics
15. Black Women's Community Development Foundation, Washington, D.C.
16. Business and Professional Women
17. Center for a Voluntary Society
18. Church Women United
19. Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women
    Department of Labor
20. Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession
    Department of Political Science, University of Illinois, Urbana
21. Day Care and Child Development Council
22. Delta Kappa Gamma
23. Delta Sigma Theta
24. Detroit Industrial Mission
25. D.C. Commission on the Status of Women
26. Emma Willard Task Force on Education, Minneapolis, Minn.

27. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
    Federal Women's Program
28. The Feminist Press
29. Girl Scouts of America
30. Girl Scouts of America, Metropolitan Council
31. League of Women Voters
32. Montgomery County (Marvland) Commission for Women
33. NAACP
34. National Association of Media Women
35. National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women
36. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
37. National Council of Administrative Women in Education
38. National Council of Negro Women
39. National Welfare Rights Organization
40. National Organization for Women—National and D.C.
41. Phi Delta Kappa
42. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
43. Women on Words and Images, Princeton, N.J.
44. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
    Women's Action Program
45. Women's Equity Action League
46. Women's Media Workshop, Washington, D.C.
47. YWCA

APPENDIX B

Conference Highlights and Reminders

SEX ROLE STEREOTYPES CONFERENCE
November 24-26, 1972
Airlie House
Warrenton, Virginia

Welcome

The NEA Teacher Rights Division and U.S. Office of Education welcome you to an exciting working conference. The conference materials, panel discussions and workshops that you will participate in this weekend are designed to help you understand sex role differentiation as experienced by American Indians, Asians, Blacks, Chicanas, Puerto Ricans, and Whites, and to eliminate discriminatory sexual stereotyping from all aspects of public school life.

Feel free to call on the NEA conference staff should you need any assistance.

Reminders

Conference recorders should plan to meet at 9:30 p.m., Friday, to discuss assignments. The room will be announced during the first general session. Do not forget to return all completed recorder forms to the Registration Desk.

Lost materials will be replaced for $15.00.

Don't miss any of the scheduled meals; the Airlie House dining room is the only one within miles.

Messages will be held at the Registration Desk.

Conference Personalities

ELIZABETH DUNCAN KOONTZ, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, Special Counselor to the Secretary for Women's Programs, Director of the Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C.

Ms. Koontz, a past president of the NEA, was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor in April 1971 and has served as Director of the Women's Bureau and U.S. Delegate to the United Nations since 1969. She previously worked for many years as a special education teacher in Salisbury, N.C. Ms. Koontz received the M.A. degree from Atlanta University, the B.A. from Livingston College.

LOUISE R. WHITE, Director, Teacher Corps, Washington, D.C.

Before becoming director of the Teacher Corps, Ms. White was a history, English, and drama teacher. She also worked in Los Angeles as an interviewer for KTTV, educational consultant to the city schools, program management

specialist to the Economic Youth Opportunities Agency, and probation counselor for the county probation department. Ms. White is a past director of the Conference on the Black Woman's Agenda and is the author of many publications, including: "The Black Woman's Agenda," "Limited Employment Opportunities for Women," "Implications of New Divorce Law in California," and "A Perspective of Community Involvement in Education." Ms. White received the Ph.D. degree from Claremont Graduate School, the M.A. degree from California State University, and the B.A. degree from Arkansas State College.

CECILIA SUAREZ, Associate Professor of Education, California Polytechnical State University, Pomona, California.

Currently an associate professor of education, Ms. Suarez is chairwoman of both the National Chicana Foundation and the Los Angeles Head Start agency, MENA. She previously taught in elementary and junior high school and directed a community action program and a bilingual/bicultural head start training program through the UCLA Chicano Studies Department. Ms. Suarez received the M.A. degree from Cal State, Los Angeles, and is completing her doctoral studies at UCLA.

CELESTE ULRICH, Professor of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Ms. Ulrich, who is vice president of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation and chairperson of the AAHPER Physical Education Division, has been a professor at UNC since 1956. She is the author of *The Growing Years—Adolescence* (AAHPER, 1962) and *The Social Matrix of Physical Education* (Prentice-Hall, 1968). Ms. Ulrich received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, and the M.A. and B.S. degrees from the University of North Carolina.

MICHELE D. RUSSELL, Consultant, Detroit, Michigan.

Currently a consultant in race relations, Ms. Russell was formerly on the staff of the Detroit Industrial Mission. She has been a guest lecturer on Black art, history, and politics and the psychology of racism; research assistant and editor of the McCone Commission advisory report on the history of race riots in the U.S.; and consultant to the Los Angeles Human Relations Commission on police-community relations and racism. Ms. Russell has written "Erased, Debased, and Encased: The Dynamics of Black Education Colonization in America" (*College English*, April 1970) and "Notes Toward a Radical Course in Black Literature" (*The Radical Teacher*, Winter 1969). She received the B.A. degree from the University of Southern California and is a Ph.D. candidate at Brown University.

FLORENCE HOWE, Professor of Humanities, SUNY at Old Westbury, New York.

Ms. Howe, founder and editor of *The Feminist Press* and editorial board member of *Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, has taught at SUNY since

1971. She previously taught at Goucher and Queens Colleges, Hofstra University, and the University of Wisconsin. Ms. Howe directed the Goucher-Baltimore City Schools Pilot Project in the Teaching of Poetry. She received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Wisconsin, the M.A. from Smith, and the B.A. from Hunter College.

WADE WILSON, President, Cheyney State College, Cheyney, Pennsylvania. Wade serves as an elected member of the Executive Committee of NEA. He is active in many activities including the Council on Human Relations and has just completed a term as President of the Council on Human Relations.

SAMUEL B. ETHRIDGE, Director, NEA Teacher Rights Division. He directs NEA programs in the promotion of Human and Civil Rights of Educators and Students and providing leadership for solving social problems.

MARGARET STEVENSON, Assistant Executive Secretary for Programs, NEA. She directs NEA programs outlined in the six program goal areas. An advocate of classroom teachers, Margaret is presently the highest ranking female staff member of NEA.

SHIRLEY McCUNE, Associate Director, Human Relations Section, NEA Teacher Rights Division. Shirley has had primary responsibility for the implementation of the conference.

HAZEL BLAKEY, Conference Coordinator, NEA Teacher Rights Division. Hazel has played a key role in the development and implementation of the conference. She is responsible for administrative support for the conference.

NORAH ALEMANY, University of California, Riverside. Norah's primary interest is in early childhood education. Her workshop will discuss models for *Non-Sexist Early Childhood Education.*

JOAN BARTL, Women on Words and Images, Princeton, New Jersey. Joan is a member of a team of women who have established themselves as experts in articulating ways that sexism is perpetuated in elementary schools and means of bringing about change. She will present materials in the workshop on *Consciousness-Raising Techniques for Changing Schools.*

ROGIE BENDER, Women on Words and Images, Princeton, New Jersey. Rogie has established herself as an action-oriented member of the Women on Words and Images group. She will be presenting her ideas in the workshop on *Consciousness-Raising Techniques for Changing Schools.*

JAN BIRK, University of Maryland Counseling Center, College Park, Maryland. Jan, a clinical psychologist, has been active in programs which meet the needs of college and the mature woman. More recently, she has been working to develop career counseling models for high school girls. This will be presented in the workshop, *Experience-Based Career Exploration.*

CECILIA BURCIAGA, a program analyst at the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, has been working on the "Mexican American Education Study."

CYNTHIA EATON, Women on Words and Images, Princeton, New Jersey. Cynthia is a leader in raising the awareness of others to the ways that sex role stereotypes affect education. She participated in planning the Conference and developing materials, and will discuss *High School Curriculum* in her workshop.

CLAIRE FULCHER, Director, Women's Resource Center, YWCA. Claire has been an active participant in the development of the Conference. She has recently assumed responsibility for the YWCA's Women's Resource Center. She will participate in the workshop on *Students and Sex Role Stereotyping.*

MARTHA GERSHUN, The Feminist Press, Old Westbury, New York. Martha has been working with teachers in the New York City School System to develop materials that incorporate women's roles and contributions. She prepared materials for the conference and will present them in the workshop *Women's History-Herstory.*

ANNE GRANT, National Organization for Women, New York City, New York. Anne, chairperson of the NOW Committee on Education, is an outstanding leader in documenting how schools promote sexism. She has recently developed the multimedia presentation, *Our North American Foremothers,* which provides a much needed resource depicting the contribution of women.

CHARLOTTE HALLAM, Staff Associate, DuShane Fund, NEA. Charlotte, a DuShane Fund lawyer in the NEA Teacher Rights Division, has led the way in the litigation of women's rights as they affect teachers. She will present a workshop on *Legal Tools To Fight Sex Discrimination.*

CAROL JACOBS, Women on Words and Images, Princeton, New Jersey. Carol, a member of the dynamic team making up the Women on Words and Images, has assisted in the development of materials for the conference and will be presenting ideas in the workshop on *High School Curriculum.*

KATE KIRKHAM, Program Associate, NEA Teacher Rights Division. Kate's primary NEA responsibilities are in the field of human relations training.

BETTY LEVY, Teachers College, Columbia University. Betty's research on the socialization of children appeared in *Feminist Studies.* She developed an article for the December 1972 issue of *Today's Education.* Her workshop, *Identifying and Changing Our Own Sexist Behavior with Children,* will give participants a chance to better understand how classroom procedures and practices perpetuate sex role stereotypes.

CORA McHENRY, Arkansas Education Association. Cora is well known within NEA for her training skills and work in the field of human relations.

GAIL McLURE, Education Department, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. Gail was the first author to articulate problems of sex role stereotyping in the NEA journal, *Today's Education*. She has played a key leadership role in the state of Iowa in developing efforts to combat sex role stereotyping. She will present her ideas in the workshop on *Institutional Sex Role Stereotyping*.

JOHN McLURE, Education Department, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. One of the first persons in teacher training institutions to draw attention to the problems of sex role stereotyping. He will present strategies for a systems approach to changing educational practice in the workshop, *Institutional Sex Role Stereotyping*.

VERNE MOBERG, The Feminist Press, Old Westbury, New York. Verne, a skilled writer and editor, has assisted with many of the conference materials. She will be presenting a workshop outlining ways that community groups can be involved in reducing sex role stereotypes.

ELLEN PATTON, Director, Student Counseling Project, YWCA Women's Resource Center. Ellen has been committed to the involvement of girls in developing models for counseling. She has made the arrangements and will participate in the workshop on *Students and Sex Role Stereotyping*.

MAYDENE PAYSOURE, Training Department, NAACP. Maydene, a vital and active resource for the planning of the conference, brings a wealth of experience in social change efforts. She will be presenting a workshop on *Community Involvement*.

CORRINE PERKINS, Iowa City Schools, Iowa City, Iowa. Corrine's interests in sex role stereotypes and the development of materials are combined in the slide show "Dick and Jane Receive a Lesson in Sex Discrimination." The show will be available for use in educational associations and cooperating groups.

LETTY POGREBIN, *Ms. Magazine*, New York. Letty's primary interest and responsibility with *Ms. Magazine* is the coverage and development of nonsexist materials for children. She will be presenting one of the projects of the Ms. Foundation.

ALTHEA SIMMONS, Director for Training, NAACP. Althea, a leader in the women's movement and women's participation in the labor force, has participated in the development of the conference. She will be giving specific ideas for implementing *Affirmative Action for Education* in her workshop.

MARY FAITH TANNEY, University of Maryland Counseling Center, College Park, Maryland. Faith, a psychologist, has been working to increase high school girls' interests in career planning. She will be presenting one model in the workshop on *Experience-Based Career Exploration*.

SUZANNE TAYLOR, Research Director, Connecticut Education Association, Hartford, Connecticut. Suzanne, who helped organize the Spring 1972 CEA Conference on the 51% Minority, will conduct a workshop on *Women in Education*.

LENORE WEITZMAN, Professor, University of California, Davis. Lenore is well known for her research on children's books. Her presentation during the conference represents continuing research into the messages that textbooks give to children.

SARA ZIMET, Reading Research Project, University of Colorado Medical School, Denver, Colorado. Sara has been involved in the study of instruction since 1952. She is the editor of the book *What Children Read in Schools.* Her workshop will focus on techniques for analyzing institutional materials.

APPENDIX C

Conference Program

Friday, November 24

9:30 a.m.	Registration Opens
12:00 NOON	Buffet Lunch
1:30 p.m.	Opening Remarks *Sam Ethridge, Director* *Teacher Rights* *Presiding*
	Welcome from NEA *Margaret Stevenson* *Program Director, NEA*
	Remarks *Louise White, Director* *Teacher Corps* *U.S. Office of Education*
2:15 p.m.	Break
2:45 p.m.	General Session–Presiding: *Dr. Wade Wilson, President* *Cheyney College* *NEA Executive Committee*
	Conference Framework *Shirley McCune*
3:00 p.m.	Panel–Education for Survival *Elizabeth Koontz–Moderator* *Director, Women's Bureau* *U.S. Department of Labor*
	Schools and Economic Survival *Michele Russell, Consultant* *Detroit, Michigan*
	Schools and Physical Survival *Celeste Ulrich* *University of North Carolina*
	Schools and Psychological/ Cultural Survival *Cecilia Suarez* *National Chicana Foundation*
4:15 p.m.	Small Groups Discussions of Panel Presentation–Group assignment by name badge.
5:30 p.m.	Free Time
6:30 p.m.	Dinner
7:30 p.m.	Continuation of Small Group Discussion Sessions

8:30 p.m.	General Session—Questions for the Panel
9:30 p.m.	Social Hour

Saturday, November 25

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Slide Show *Sex Role Stereotyping in Textbooks* *Lenore Weitzman* *Dale Bustamante* *University of California, Davis*
10:00 a.m.	Workshops Education Association Involvement *Cora McHenry* *Arkansas Education Association* *Kate Kirkham* *National Education Association* Racism/Sexism *Michele Russell, Consultant* *Detroit, Michigan* Analyzing Instructional Materials—Content Analysis *Sara Zimet* *University of Colorado Medical School* Non-Sexist Early Childhood Education *Norah Alemany* *University of California, Riverside* Consciousness Raising Techniques for Changing Schools *Rogie Bender* *Joan Bartl* *Women on Words and Images* So You Want To Teach Women's Studies? *Florence Howe* *SUNY/Old Westbury* Institutional Sex Role Stereotyping *John McLure* *Gail McLure* *University of Iowa* Students and Sex Role Stereotyping *Ellen Patton* *Claire Fulcher* *Students* *YWCA Women's Resource Center*

Community Involvement
Maydene Paysoure
NAACP

Happenings in Your Head
Verne Moberg
Feminist Press

12:00 NOON — Lunch

2:00 p.m. — "Free To Be You and Me"
Letty Pogrebin
Ms. Foundation

2:30 p.m. — Slide Show Presentation
Women on Words and Images
Sex Stereotyping in Children's Reading

3:15 p.m. — Workshops

Women in Education
Suzanne Taylor
Connecticut Education Association

Use of Media for Community Action

Our North American Foremothers
National Organization for Women
Anne Grant

Experience Based Career Exploration
Jan Birk
Mary Faith Tanney
University of Maryland

Identifying and Changing Our Own Sexist Behavior with Children
Betty Levy
Teachers College
Columbia University

High School Curriculum
Cynthia Eaton
Carol Jacobs
Women on Words and Images

Affirmative Action for Education
Althea Simmons
NAACP

Legal Tools To Fight Sex Discrimination
Charlotte Hallam
DuShane Fund
National Education Association

Counseling Needs of Spanish American Boys and Girls
Cecilia Burciaga
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

	Women's History-Herstory *Martha Gershun* *Feminist Press*
5:30 p.m.	Free Time
6:30 p.m.	Dinner
7:30 p.m.	General Session Presentation–Slide Show *Corrine Perkins* *Dick and Jane Receive a Lesson in Sex Discrimination*
	Special Interest Caucuses Special Interest Workshops

Sunday, November 26

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:00 a.m.	Schools and Political Survival *Florence Howe* *Feminist Press*
9:45 a.m.	Framework for Action–*Shirley McCune*
10:00 a.m.	State and Regional Group Meetings Back Home Plans
11:30 a.m.	Reporting and General Session *Sam Ethridge*
	A Look to the Future *Dr. Wade Wilson*
12:30 p.m.	Lunch

APPENDIX D

Statement by Black Caucus

November 26, 1972

STATEMENT OF CONCERN TO: Shirley McCune, Conference Director
Margaret Stevenson
Samuel B. Ethridge

We as participants of The Sex Role Stereotype Conference recognize that there is a need for counseling of all minority students. Therefore, we feel that the workshop focusing on counseling should have been multi-ethnic in scope since we recognize that students are not only counseled by professionals from their particular ethnic background but in many cases by professionals of other ethnic/racial backgrounds.

We feel that the tone for multi-ethnic counseling should be stressed by NEA because of the cultural, socio-economic, linguistic and psychological make-up of young people in the educational system. The very omission of multi-ethnic counseling historically has perpetuated low self-esteem, intellectual alienation and has deprived minority students of the survival skills necessary to become effective and productive members of the American work force.

We recommend that future NEA conferences of this type focus on counseling in its entirety. To avoid further negative emphasis on the many differences within our multi-ethnic culture, we should be prepared to deal with these differences constructively. We feel NEA should provide the materials and qualified staff members to effectively foster better relationships among all professional educators and counselors.

Black Caucus
Conference on Sex Role Stereotypes

cc: George Jones
NEA Minority Caucus

PRECONFERENCE MATERIALS

TITLE	SOURCE	DESCRIPTION
"Education for Survival: Schools and Sex Role Stereotypes"	Shirley McCune NEA Teacher Rights	Collection of articles and questions related to the ways schools prepare children for physical, economic, psychological, cultural, and political roles.
Physical Roles		
"Human Status for Women"	Kathryn F. Clarenbach - Speech to Midwest Association for Physical Education of College Women	Discussion of the manner in which girls, through school socialization, have been systematically denied the opportunity to develop their physical skills and participate in a wide variety of physical activity. Also a general discussion on later discrimination against women in many areas.
"Sport: Women Sit in the Back of the Bus"	Marie Hart (*Psychology Today*, October 1971)	Discussion of the relationship between femininity, athletic involvement, and achievement, and the role conflicts that result.
"Should Girls Play Football, and Boys Change Diapers?"	Sally Wendkos Olds (Reprinted by permission of The New York Company)	Discussion of sex role stereotyping in an analysis of children's play, with some discussion of parental influence.
"The Female of the Species"	Marion Corwell (*Contact* magazine, Fall 1972)	A general description of the many strengths of girls and women in comparison to their male counterparts in society, e.g., population, intellectual development, types of physical development.
"The Writing Is on the Wall for Girls Programs"	Marjorie Blaufarb (*Update*, December 1972)	An analysis of new studies and legislation affecting girls' participation in traditionally male high school athletic competitions.
"Competitive Sports for Girls: Effects on Growth, Development and Health"	G. Lawrence Rarick, University of California, in Dorothy Harris' DGWS *Research Reports: Women in Sports*. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1971	A discussion of girls' physical development, maturation, and health in relation to participation in athletic activity and competition, and vice versa.

TITLE	SOURCE	DESCRIPTION
Economic Roles		
"Twenty Facts on Women Workers"	U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare National Center for Social Statistics U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics and Wage and Hour Division	Basic facts on women in labor market
Steps To Advance Equal Employment Opportunity for Women	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	A guide for organizations to adopt toward the advancement of opportunity for women.
Women as Percent of Total Workers in Selected Nonfarm Occupations, April 1972	Women's Bureau - Employment Standards Administration	Graph on this subject
"Fully Employed Women Continue To Earn Less than Fully Employed Men of Either White or Minority Races"	Women's Bureau - Employment Standards Administration	Graph on this subject
"Most Women Work Because of Economic Need"	Women's Bureau - Employment Standards Administration	Graph on this subject
"Counseling for Careers"	Joyce Denebrink (*Contact* magazine, Fall 1972)	A discussion of women's opportunities in the job market. A look at career placement attitudes, responses from business recruiters, and the future of women in business.
Psychological/Cultural Roles		
"Women's Liberation or Exploding the Fairy Princess Myth"	Anne Grant West (*Scholastic Magazine*, November 1971)	A discussion of underachievement, or failure to achieve success

"A bright woman is caught in a double bind. In achievement-oriented situations, she worries not only about failure, but also about success."	Matina Horner (*Psychology Today*)	A study of why women so often tend to avoid success, done on the basis of TAT tests administered to groups of college men and women.
"Sexual Discrimination in the Elementary School"	Myra Sadker and David Sadker (*The National Elementary Principal,* October 1972)	Discussion of male and female role awareness in elementary school children, as a partial result of teacher influence and the elementary school experience.
"Look Jane Look, See Sex Stereotypes"	Women on Words and Images (*NJEA Review*, March 1972)	A study of elementary school texts and their effects on socialization.
"Black Woman"	Vistula Chapman Department of History Temple University	A discussion of the theme of black women as a dominant force in the development and survival of black people, and the relationship of black women to the women's movement in general.
"The Building of the Gilded Cage"	Jo Freeman (Reprinted from *The Third Year: Women's Liberation, 1971*)	Analysis of how the overall political structure affects women, from a legal, sociological, and psychological framework.
"Sister and Brother: Getting Ahead Together"	Aileen C. Hernandez (*Contact* magazine, Fall 1972)	A discussion of the dual oppression of Black women as Blacks and as women.
"White Over Black: Racism and Sexism in American Society"	Marie M. Fortune - paper for Resource Center on Women, YWCA	A discussion of the relationship between racism and sexism–both products of the dominant white male culture.
Recommendations to HEW Women's Action Program	HEW Spanish-Speaking Women's Concerns Group	An article on making the women's action program relevant to Spanish-speaking women. Includes:
Background Information	HEW Spanish-Speaking Women's Concerns Group	Facts on Americans of Spanish origin and Mexican-Americans in the U.S.

TITLE	SOURCE	DESCRIPTION
"Recommended Research Project VII"	HEW Spanish-Speaking Women's Concerns Group	Project recommendation to study the development of a Chicana Perspective.
"Recommended Research Project IX"	HEW Spanish-Speaking Women's Concerns Group	Research project recommendation to study Chicana pattern of marriage as it may relate to Chicanas' subordinate status in American society.
"Colonized Woman, The Chicana"	Elizabeth Sutherland (In *Sisterhood Is Powerful,* edited by Robin Morgan. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.	A discussion of women as a colonized group, not merely an oppressed one.
"The Mexican-American Woman"	Enriqueta Longauex y Vasquez (In *Sisterhood Is Powerful,* edited edited by Robin Morgan. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.)	A look at the history of Chicana women, and also a more current description of the status of the Chicana woman in her relationship to her household, husband, and children.
"Las Mujeres Encouraged To Get Involved"	Mary Barber *(Los Angeles Times,* April 30, 1972)	A call to Chicana women to become involved in their liberation, role changes, birth control, etc.
"Changing the School Environment"	Doris Schumacher *(Women: A Journal of Liberation,* volume 2, no. 4, 1972)	One family's approach to effecting change in an elementary school's attitude toward sex role stereotypes.
CONFERENCE MATERIALS		
"Sexism in the Schools"	Diane Divoky, Sheila Jackson (*Learning* magazine, November 1972)	Includes a contract signed by single women teachers in 1915, an article showing two opposing opinions on sexism in the schools, and a questionnaire on sexism for teachers.
"Equal Opportunity for Women: How Possible and How Quickly"	Florence Howe, SUNY/College at Old Westbury	A discussion of the women's studies program at Old Westbury, and the broad needs of women in education.

"Sexism in the Elementary Schools"	Carol Jacobs, Cynthia Eaton Princeton (New Jersey) Regional Schools	Discussion of sex role stereotyping and socialization in elementary schools.
"A Child's-Eye View of Sex Roles	Lynne B. Iglitzin Department of Political Science University of Washington	A study of sex role stereotyping conducted on schoolchildren in Seattle.
"Feminist Studies"	Carol Ahlum, Jackie Fralley The Feminist Press Old Westbury, New York	A look at feminist studies at the secondary school level.
"Do Teachers Sell Girls Short?"	Betty Levy Teachers College Columbia University	Analysis of how schools function to perpetuate traditional sex role stereotypes.
"New Legal Remedies for Women"	Betty Sinowitz, NEA Teacher Rights	Discussion of the legal tools necessary and used to eliminate discrimination by sex in education, as well as in a broader societal framework.
"American History and Herstory"	Martha L. Gershun The Feminist Press Old Westbury, New York	Historical examination of women's rights. Recommends curriculum materials for history courses.
"Bibliography on the Treatment of Girls in School"	The Feminist Press Old Westbury, New York	Bibliography on sex role stereotypes in the schools.
"History and Social Science Resource Bulletin"	Board of Education of City of New York, Office of Instructional Sources, Bureau of Social Studies	Curriculum recommendations for women's studies at the secondary level.

TITLE	SOURCE	DESCRIPTION
"Outlines of Courses on Feminism for Use in High School"	Cynthia Eaton, Carol Jacobs Princeton (New Jersey) Regional Schools	Sample outline for high school course on feminism.
"NEA Guidelines for Treatment of Minorities and Women"	John Browne NEA Teacher Rights	Proposed guideline for curriculum and instructional materials for implementation in elementary and secondary schools.
"Recommendations for Elimination of Sex Role Stereotyping in School Curriculum"	Sullivan Associates Menlo Park, California	Analysis of sex role stereotyping in schools and recommendations for its elimination.
"Women in U.S. History High School Texts"	Janice Law Trecker (*Social Education*, March 1971)	Analysis of the portrayal of women in U.S. history textbooks.
"Non-Sexist Education in Your Classroom"	Laura Collver Classroom Teacher Peoria, Illinois	An article directed to teachers interested in non-sexist teaching.
"Physical Education Questionnaires"	Kalamazoo (Michigan) Task Force Investigating Sex Discrimination in the Schools	Questionnaires on attitudes toward physical education participation in the schools. Used for identifying sex stereotypes and discrimination.
"Discrimination of Women in Sports"	Bob Dunning Berkeley, California	Discussion of the discrimination women face in the area of sports and athletic competition.
"A Chauvinistic Index for Educators"	NOW	Index by which educators may test their own sexism.
"Believing Can Make It So"	Peg Jones National Foundation for the Improvement of Education Washington, D.C.	Exercise for examining one's sex role stereotyping behavior.

"Will the Real Mr. Flower Stand Up"	Shirley McCune, NEA Teacher Rights Peg Jones National Foundation for the Improvement of Education Washington, D.C.	Exercise to help teachers understand sex role stereotypes.
[illegible]	Pam Root Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction Olympia, Washington	Affirmative action practices related to women, and guidelines for developing education programs for girls.
"How Sexist Are I as a Counselor?"	Janice Birk, Mary Faith Tanney University of Maryland	Guidelines to help counselors and teachers analyze their sexist attitudes.
"Student Attitude Checklist"	Janice Birk, Mary Faith Tanney University of Maryland	Guidelines to help students analyze their own sexist attitudes.
"Career Explorations for High School A Model"	Janice Birk, Mary Faith Tanney University of Maryland	Analysis of career opportunities for high school women.
"Evaluating Sexism in Your School"	NEA Teacher Rights	Questionnaire used to evaluate sexism in the schools.
"Analyzing Instructional Materials Content Analysis Procedures"	Sara Zimet University of Colorado Medical School	Guidelines for analyzing content of instructional materials.
"A Feminist Approach to the Women's Colleges"	Bernice Sandler Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges	A discussion of all women's colleges in terms of feminist ideology.

TITLE	SOURCE	DESCRIPTION
"Feminist Resources for Elementary and Secondary Schools"	Carol Ahlum, Jackie Fralley The Feminist Press Old Westbury, New York	A list of resources available for teachers, students, and parents on sexism and feminism.
"Legal Tools to Fight Sex Discrimination"	Charlotte Hallam NEA Teacher Rights	Cases of legal action to eliminate sex role stereotyping.

APPENDIX F

Conference Participants

ABICHT, Monika
Instructor
University of Cincinnati
203 N. Winterstreet
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

AHLUM, Carol
No. 7 Amherst Road
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

ALEMANY, Norah
Associate Teacher-Trainer
Montessori Institute of L. A.
296 E. Green Street
Claremont, California 91711

ALMADA, David
NEA Chicano Caucus
853 W. La Repetto Drive
Monterey Park, California 91754

ALROY, Phyllis
Consultant
Women on Words and Images
30 Valley Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

ARNOLD, Dean (Ms.)
Florida Education Association
105 Shelby Drive
Lake City, Florida 32055

AUSTIN, C. Danford
Professional Development
Consultant
Michigan Education Association
Office of Human Relations
1216 Kendale Boulevard
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

BARCUS, Virginia
Harvard Graduate School of Ed.
50 Stanton Road
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146

BARNES, Bart
Reporter
Washington Post
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

BARTL, Joan
Women on Words and Images
30 Valley Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

BENDER, Rogie
Consultant
Women on Words and Images
30 Valley Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

BIRK, Janice M.
Counseling/Psychologist
University of Maryland
Counseling Center
College Park, Maryland 20903

BLAKEY, Hazel
NEA Staff
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

BLAUFARB, Marjorie
Editor and Writer
AAHPER/NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

BOSMA, Boyd
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

BROWN, Phyllis
Consultant
Women on Words and Images
30 Valley Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

BUSCH, Gloria J.
Chairperson
Human Relations Commission
Connecticut Education Association
21 Oak Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

CAMPBELL, Deborah
NEA Staff
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CAPELLE, Elizabeth
Feminists on Children's Media
312 West 103 Street
New York, New York 10025

CLARK, Nancy R.
Vice President
Maine Teachers Association
RFD No. 2, Lambert Road
Freeport, Maine 04032

COHEN, Belle T.
Education Specialist
Bureau of Education for Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. ROB
Washington, D.C. 20202

COLEMAN, Ernestine
Teacher
Montgomery County Public Schools
5028 Bel Pre Road
Silver Spring, Maryland 20906

COLLIER, Laura
Peoria Organization of Women for
Equal Rights
824 W. Stratford Drive
Peoria, Illinois 61614

COMLEY, Lynda M.
Education Writer
Daily Press, Inc.
P.O. Box 747
Hampton, Virginia 23669

COURTOIS, Christine
Resident Director
Resident Life
University of Maryland
110 Denton Hall
College Park, Maryland 20142

COX, Ann
Manager
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CRAFT, Silas E.
School Administrator
Montgomery County Public Schools
12907 Morningside Lane
Silver Spring, Maryland 20904

CRUMBY, Carol A.
Personnel Specialist
Community Action Project
805 Eldora Place
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15210

CUNNIFF, Ellen
Field Consultant
New Jersey Department of Education
38 Maple Avenue
Belleville, New Jersey 07109

DANIELS, Joan
Director
Building Blocks School
58 Grand Street
New York, New York 10013

DANSBY, Rose
Teacher
Albuquerque Public Schools
2211 Cleopatra Place, N.E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87112

DAVIDS, Joyce
Nansemond Suffolk Head
6004 Benston Lane
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

DELUCA, Maria
Filmmaker
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

DORR, Robin
Writer
U.S. Department of Labor
14th and Constitution Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20001

DOTCH, Martha
NEA Staff
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

DUNKLE, Margaret
Research Associate
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

DUNSON, Lynn
Reporter
Washington *Star*
225 Virginia Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

DUSEK, Nancy
Harvard University
44 Perkins Hall
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

DUTCH, Terri
Educational Specialist
1918 Federal Building
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

EATON, Cynthia, Consultant
Women on Words and Images
25 Cleveland La., R.D. 4
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

ESCHUK, Mary E.
English Department Chairperson
Normandy High School
7195 Edencare Drive
Parma, Ohio 44134

ETHRIDGE, Samuel B.
Director
NEA Teacher Rights Division
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

EVANS, Eleanor
4935 Quebec Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

FABER, Mary
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

FEDERBUSH, Marcia
Committee To Eliminate Sex
Discrimination in Public Schools
1000 Cedar Bend Drive
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

FIELDER, Barbara
Nameless Sisterhood
5309 Worthington Drive
Washington, D.C. 20016

FRALLEY, Jacqueline M.
WMTFESPS
47 Amherst Road, RFD No. 2
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

FRASER, Arvonne S.
Vice-President
WEAL
1253 4th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

FROST, Delyte D.
Communications Workers of America
4338 River Road, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

FUTCHER, Claire
Director of Women's Resource Center
National Board
YWCA
600 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022

GABRIEL, Regina Delaine
Toledo NAACP Youth and Young
Adult Chapter
3360 Downing Road
Toledo, Ohio 43607

GARNER, Gerry
3201 Landover Street, #1402
Alexandria, Virginia 22305

GERE, Judith, Consultant
National Capital Union Presbytery
Task Force on Women
2651 Old Dominion
McLean, Virginia 22101

GERSHUN, Martha, Chairwoman
The Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, New York 11568

GOLDEN, Gloria, Director
Far West Laboratory for
Educational R & D
2964 Shasta Road
Berkeley, California 94708

GORDON, Lola D.
1415 King Street
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601

GRACE, Nelson
Youth Advisor
NAACP
2360 Fulton Street
Toledo, Ohio 43620

GRAMBS, Dr. Jean D.
University of Maryland
College of Education
College Park, Maryland 20742

GRANDSTAFF, John, Chairman
Michigan Education Association
24 Garrison Avenue
Battle Creek, Michigan 49017

GRANT, Anne, Educ. Coordinator
National Organization for Women
617 49th Street
Brooklyn, New York 11220

GRAY, Lee L., Editor-Writer
USOE
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

GREENBERG, Selma
Associate Professor
Hofstra University
Hempstead Turnpike
Hempstead, New York 11021

GREFE, Mary, State President
AAUW
3000 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50312

GROEBEL, Jan
Dundalk Community College
6903 Mornington Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21222

HALLAM, Charlotte
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

HARDY, Nesa
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

HARVEY, Gerry, Teacher G.S. 9
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Route 1, Box 2
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

HEATH, Dr. Kathryn,
Asst. Spec. Stud.
Office of Education
730 24th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

HEFLIN, Jean
Spec. Asst.
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

HILL, Earline E.
Route 2, Box 64
Disputanta, Virginia 23842

HILLARD, Shirley
Chairman Ed. TF
N.O.W.
3800 Trailwood Lane
Fort Worth, Texas 76109

HILLIARD, Mary Ellen
Chairperson
Education Committee
National Organization For Women
3747 Huntington Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015

HOFFER, William, Freelance
Saturday Review
13416 Justice Road
Rockville, Maryland 20853

HOFFMAN, C. K.
Pub. Inf. Spec.
Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2098
Washington, D.C. 20202

HOLMES, Marilyn
Secretary-Treasurer
Colorado Commission-Status of Women
200 Fillmore, Suite 100
Denver, Colorado 80206

HOROWITZ, Arlene
Wash. Asst.
National Council of Jewish Women
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

HOWE, Florence
The Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, New York 11568

HURDLE, Beth
Communications Specialist
Virginia Education Association
116 S. Third Street
Richmond, Virginia 23228

IBRAHIM, Sandy
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

JACOBS, Carol
LDTC/Consultant
Women on Words and Images
30 Valley Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

JACOBS, Jo, Chairwoman
Committee To Study Sex. Discrimination
in the Schools
732 Garland Avenue
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

JAMES, Dorothy, Teacher
318 W. Patterson Street
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007

JENNINGS, Laura, Student
Harvard Divinity School
31 Concord Avenue, No. 42
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

JOESTING, Dr. Joan
Instructor
Sandhills Community College
Southern Pines, North Carolina 28387

JOHNSON, F. J.
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

JOHNSON, Laurie Olsen
Curriculum Writer
Sullivan Associates
3000 Sand Hill Road
Menlo Park, California 94025

JONES, Margaret J.
Associate Director
National Foundation for
Improvement of Education
1507 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

JONES, Robert C.
232 Rodney Circle
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010

KARDOKUS, Jane
Director of Legal Services
Colorado Department of Education
State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

KING, Charles T.
Professional Development Consultant
Michigan Education Association
1216 Kendale Boulevard
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

KING, Lavinia M.
Toledo NAACP Youth and Young
Adults
815 Fernwood
Toledo, Ohio 43607

KIRKHAM, Kate
NEA Staff
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

KISIELEWSKI, Julie
Program Specialist
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

KNOUS, Dwight W.
Illinois Education Association
439 Arlington
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

KNOX, Holly
Special Assistant
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 4143
Washington, D.C. 20002

KOONTZ, Elizabeth, Director
U.S. Department of Labor
Women's Bureau
14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
1830 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

KUNKEL, Georgie
Elementary Counselor
Highline Education Association
3409 S.W. Trenton Street
Seattle, Washington 98126

LEEKE, John
NEA Staff
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

LEVY, Betty
Teacher/Psychologist
Teachers College
Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

LUCIDO, Corrine
The Feminist Press
8 Bridle Path Drive
Old Westbury, New York 11568

LYNCH, John
Student
4006 Ingersol Drive
Silver Spring, Maryland 20902

McCUNE, Shirley
NEA Staff
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

McCUNE, Wesley
325 Second Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

McDONALD, Diane
Teacher
Fairfax (Virginia) Education Association
1558 Northgate Square #11A
Reston, Virginia 22090

McFERREN, M. Joyce
5200 S. Quebec Street
Suite 306
Denver, Colorado 80110

McHENRY, Cora D.
Arkansas Education Association
802 Arthur Drive
Little Rock, Arkansas 72209

McKINNEY, Louise J., Principal
Harrison Early Childhood Education Center
828 33rd Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98122

McLURE, Gail T.
Research Asst. Educ. Admin.
University of Iowa
Route 6, River Heights
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

McLURE, John W. Dr.
University of Iowa
408 Jeffereson Building
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

MARQUEZ, Anna
NEA Teacher Rights Division
3258 Descanso Drive
Los Angeles, California 90026

MARTIN, Rosemary
282 N. Main Street
Spring Valley, New York 10977

MESIAH, Frank
Chairman, HR Council
New York State United Teachers
78 Crescent
Buffalo, New York 14214

MOBERG, Verne
The Feminist Press
130 West Sixteenth Street, No. 37
New York, New York 10011

MOSES, Rose
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

MOUNTS, Kathy, UniServ Director
Indiana State Teachers Association
Route 4, East Tipp Heights
Lafayette, Indiana 47905

MULLIGAN, Kathryn
Washington Intern in Education
3701 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

MYLES, Ernestine J., Teacher
Alabama Education Association
Post Office Box B
Georgiana, Alabama 36033

NUS, Suzanne, Filmmaker
University of Iowa
Film Division
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

OLSON, Marjorie A.
Elk Grove High School
500 Elk Grove Boulevard
Elk Grove, Illinois 60007

PADILLA, Inez, D.C.C. Consultant
Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10029

PAWLEY, Mrs. Olive P.
Assistant Principal, Dean of Girls
Yorktown High School
3043 South Columbus Street, Apt. B-1
Arlington, Virginia 22206

PAYSOURE, Maydene
Training Assistant
NAACP
315 West 100th Street
New York, New York 10025

PEARSON, LaVerne
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

PECK, Lucy
Assistant Professor
Hofstra University
Hempstead, Long Island, New York 11550

PERKINS, Corine T., Teacher
815 Oakcrest Avenue
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

PERREAULT, Gerri
Emma Willard Task Force on
Education
3114 West 28th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

POGREBIN, Letty Cottin
Member - Board of Directors
Ms. Foundation
370 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

POPPENDIECK, Robert
Director Field Services
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

POPPENDIECK, Mrs. Robert
Washington, D.C.

POWER, Jane, Writer .
NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

PRECIADO de BURCIAGA, Cecilia
Civil Rights Program Analyst
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
1121 Vermont Avenue, N.W
Washington, D.C. 20425

PUTTERMAN, Julie
Student
4006 Ingersol Drive
Silver Spring, Maryland 20902

ROBBINS, Earldean
NAACP
1044 S. Citrus Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90019

RUSSELL, Michele
Cummins Foundation
73 E. Palmer
Detroit, Michigan 48202

SADKER, David
Assistant Professor
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Wood Road
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53140

SADKER, Myra
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Wood Road
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53140

SAMPLE, Molly, Research Specialist
Florida Education Association
208 W. Pensacola
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

SAMUELS, Catherine, Project Director
Women's Action Alliance
370 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

SANDOVAL, Carmel
NEA
1211 11th Street
Greeley, Colorado 80631

SAUCEDO, Tomás, Research Staff
National Education Association
10 West Del Ray Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22301

SCHELKE, Lea, Commission Member
Michigan Education Association
13659 Strathcona, Apt. 156
Southgate, Michigan 48195

SCHMIDT, Ann
Denver Post
3752 Kanawa Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015

SCHRAM, Barbara
Harvard University
60 Brattle Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

SCOTT, Betty
Coordinator, Children's Books
The Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, New York 11568

SEGMAN, Dr. Sarah
Psychologist
31 Montrose Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02158

SHAPIRO, Carol, Project Director
Women's Action Alliance
370 Lexington Avenue, Room 313
New York, New York 10017

SHARPE, Elaine First
2 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011

SIMMONS, Althea
Director for Training Programs
NAACP
1790 Broadway
New York, New York 10016

SMALLEY, Mary Jane
Chief, Development Branch
U.S. Office of Education
Northeast Division—NCIES
Washington, D.C. 20202

SORNSIN, Mary
Emma Willard Task Force on Education
P. O. 14247
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

SPRUNG, Barbara, Project Director
Non-Sexist Early Childhood Program
Women's Action Alliance
370 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

STEVENSON, Margaret
Assistant Executive Secretary
for Programs
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

STONER, Lillian
Michigan Education Association
1151 Scott Lake Road
Pontiac, Michigan 48054

SUAREZ, Cecilia, Chairwoman
National Chicana Foundation
507 E. Ellingbrook Drive
Montebello, California 90640

SULLIVAN, Catherine
Maine Teachers Association
18 Woodmont Street
Portland, Maine 04102

SWEARINGEN, Sharon
Kentucky Education Association
Maple Hills, Apartment J-4
Clarksville, Tennessee 31040

SWEDELIUS, Adele
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

TANAKA, Paul A., Chairman
NEA Asian Caucus
2000 Tacoma Mall, G. 36
Tacoma, Washington 98406

TANNEY, Mary Faith
Counseling Psychologist
University of Maryland Counseling
Center
1812 Metzenott Road
Adelphi, Maryland 20783

TATE, Carla
Research Assistant
University of California at Davis
920 Cranbrook Court, N.
No. 144
Davis, California 95616

TAYLOR, Josephine
Secretary, Connecticut Education
Association Women's Caucus
905 Burnside Avenue, B-9
East Hartford, Connecticut 06108

TAYLOR, Sue
Director, Research
Connecticut Education Association
21 Oak Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

THOMPSON, Joan R.
Federal Women's Program Coordinator
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.,
Room 2049
Washington, D.C. 20202

THRASH, Barbara E., Counselor
Central High School - BCEA
3800 Fuller Drive
Midland, Michigan 48640

THROCKMORTON, Edith M.
President
NAACP
Box 1302, 254 N. Washington Street
Rockville, Maryland 20850

TINGLIN, Aquilla B., Teacher
3421 Grand Forest Drive
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

TOWNES, Doris, Media Specialist
Monmouth City Education Association
408 Ninth Avenue
Belmar, New Jersey 07719

ULRICH, Celeste, Professor
University of North Carolina
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412

VASQUEZ, Tony
26455 S. Christiana
Chicago, Illinois 60655

VILLARREAL, Tomas, Jr.
NEA Teacher Rights
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

WALDEN, Erlina, Secretary
5200 S. Quebec
Englewood, Colorado 80110

WALTON, Patricia A.
Community College District
20 Terrace View, G. 3
Daly City, California 94015

WASHINGTON, Antoinette
National Education Association
6402 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20012

WATSON, Rowena H. Baker, Teacher
Illinois Education Association
99 Ash Street
Park Forest, Illinois 60466

WEITZMAN, Dr. Lenore
University of California-DAVIS
1100 Gough Street
San Francisco, California 94109

WENNING, Judy, Ed. Coord.
National Organization for Women
510 East 82nd Street
New York, New York 10028

WETHERBY, Phyllis, Commissioner
Pennsylvania Commission
on the Status of Women
116 Avenue L
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15221

WHITE, Dr. Louise R.
USOE Teacher Corps
HEW Code 421
Washington, D.C. 20202

WILSON, Wade
NEA
Cheyney College
Cheyney, Pennsylvania 19319

WOODWARD, Barbara J.
UniServ Representative
PSEA-NEA
15 W. Brinton's Bridge Road
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

WYNN, Nellie
825 Marseilles Street
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

ZIMET, Sara, Assistant Professor
University of Colorado Medical School
4200 E. 9th Avenue
Container No. 2621
Denver, Colorado 80220